JOHN'S PERSECUTION ETHIC

A STUDY IN THE FAREWELL DISCOURSE

By

Don Richard Riggs

Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
Religion

June, 1969
Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:	Date:
Leander E Keck	May 12, 1969
Robert W. Funk	12 May 1969
Lou H Silberman	May 12, 1969
	May 12, 1969
J Philip Hyatt	May 12, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. THE SETTING OF THE PROBLEM 1

The Study of John in Contemporary Scholarship
The Definition of the Problem
The Contemporary Studies of John's Ethic
The Methodological Presuppositions of the Study
The Outline of the Study

II. THE SITUATION OF THE JOHANNINE COMMUNITY 42

The Farewell Discourse as Bridge to the Situation
The Communal Situation: The Crisis of Persecution
The Communal Situation: The Crisis of Faith
The Results of the Analysis

III. THE ETHIC OF THE EVANGELIST 129

Expectations of a Persecution Ethic
Stylistic Characteristics of the Johannine Exhortations
Thematic Considerations in the Johannine Exhortations
John's Persecution Ethic
John's Ethic and Contemporary Studies

IV. THE RELATION OF JOHN TO OTHER PERSECUTION LITERATURE 198

John in the Development of Persecution Literature
Enoch 91-105
I Peter
Summary of the Analysis

CONCLUSIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY 223

BIBLIOGRAPHY 228

ABBREVIATIONS OF PERIODICALS

BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*
EvTh	*Evangelische Theologie*
Ex	*Expositor*
Interp	*Interpretation*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JTC	*Journal for Theology and the Church*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NT	*Novum Testamentum*
RB	*Revue Biblique*
SJT	*Scottish Journal of Theology*
SEAJT	*South East Asia Journal of Theology*
TS	*Theological Studies*
ThEH	*Theologische Existenz Heute*
ThL	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
ThR	*Theologische Rundschau*
ThZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZST	*Zeitschrift der Systematischen Theologie*

CHAPTER I

THE SETTING OF THE PROBLEM

A. The Study of John in Contemporary Scholarship

Contemporary scholarship has heralded the author of the Fourth Gospel as the quintessence of early Christian theological reflection.[1] This evangelist, in seeming contradistinction to the authors of the synoptic accounts, has developed a theological system which is executed with the utmost logical rigor. Accordingly, the primary concern of commentary on this theological endeavor has been to ferret out the right key by means of which the mysteries of johannine thought might be unlocked. In recent times this investigation appears to have crystalized in religionsgeschichtliche considerations and the setting of johannine theology in its proper Near Eastern background.[2] The continuum throughout these diverse attempts has been the theological system itself, presented in seeming isolation from considerations of worldly and communal events which might be influential in the development of John's position.

---

[1] This statement can be supported by any number of references. In the Theology of the New Testament (trans. by K. Grobel, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955), R. Bultmann centers his attention on pauline and johannine theology which, for him, are the highlights of New Testament theology. It is significant that the central issue of the eschatological occurrence in Jesus (Vol. 1, pp. 4ff) is, according to Bultmann, clarified and carried through by John and not Paul (Vol. 2, pp. 9-10); thus, John is the New Testament theologian for Bultmann. C. H. Dodd points to the thought of the gospel being "so original and creative that a search for its 'sources,' or even for the 'influences' by which it may have been affected" may miss the impact of the book (The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge: The University Press, 1953, p. 6). E. Titus adds that "the fourth evangelist was in no sense a compiler of earlier tradition (as were the synoptic evangelists), but was a composer in the true sense of the word. The term 'creative' best describes his religious and literary genius (The Message of the Fourth Gospel, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957, p. 13). E. Hoskyns asserts: "The Gospel according to Saint John is a strictly 'theological' work. Long ago Clement of Alexandria, fully aware of the broad distinction between the Fourth Gospel and the earlier gospels in which the bodily or 'sensible' facts concerning the life and death of Jesus had been set forth, defined it as the 'Spiritual gospel;' and the Church, surely with proper discernment, has consistently named its author 'The Theologian'" (The Fourth Gospel, London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1940, p. 3). Finally, Martin Dibelius has stated: "If already the synoptic evangelists are not reports but witnesses to faith, then this applies to John in a special sense, for it is a more systematic, more independent, and more bold expression than those (the synoptics) which brings to expression not what Jesus was but what the

Because the emphasis has been on the theological system, it is little wonder that the ethic of John has been approached, if at all, as a peripheral derivitive. Chapter 1 attempts to demonstrate this contention. In contrast to the usual procedure, this study proposes that there is another, perhaps more helpful, method by which to investigate John's gospel. Such an approach finds an appropriate subject matter

---

Christians have in Jesus" ("Johannesevangelium," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Vol. 3, 2nd ed., ed. by H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1929, p. 350).

[2] Scholars continue to debate whether John's background is predominantly a Jewish-Hebraic milieu (Schlatter, Hoskyns, Braun, Schnackenburg, Cullmann), a Hellenistic-Jewish background (Dodd, Goodspeed, Klijn) or, more recently, a milieu closely connected with Mandean thought (Bultmann, W. Bauer, Schweizer, Becker).

in the johannine ethic. The quarrel with the massive amount of, often excellent, studies on John is not with the investigation of the theology of the Fourth Gospel _per se_; but it is with the strictly theological emphasis often advanced which distorts many of the issues and problems faced by the evangelist and the community to which he writes.

The ethic of John has been overlooked due to several contributing factors. First, most exegetes have begun with John 1 and have moved their theological investigations from that starting point sequentially through to the end of the book. However, such a procedure gives a distorted vision of the whole because a simple theological progression from chapters 1-21 does not do justice to the intricacy of thought reflected in the gospel. For example, those who take 1:14 and "we beheld his glory" as the key to the whole never get beyond that glorification christology to the provoking issues facing the community being addressed by John later in the work. By advancing such a christology for the whole gospel, those researchers will likely envision a community of enthusiasts.[3] Such a view, which seems to follow from chapter 1, fails to see the problem of the absence of Jesus which lies as a root problem in the farewell discourse.

Further, those who settle for a staunch emphasis on present eschatology and life-now postulates, which appear to bubble forth from chapters 1-12, fail to give fair accord for the dramatic context of the farewell discourse where concern for faithfulness is exhorted and where the difference between Jesus and the Paraclete is expressed.[4] By missing such issues exegetes fail to pay heed to the continuing association which John has with apocalyptic and with the ethical concerns and questions which proceed from such a base.

---

[3] As, for example, Käsemann and Schweizer have done; cf. E. Käsemann, _Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17_, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966, and E. Schweizer, "Der Kirchenbegriff im Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes," _Neotestamentica_, Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963, pp. 254-271.

Instead of concentrating on a theological theme, often selected because of its current interest for the researcher, the argument of this dissertation seeks a key--perhaps the key--in the situation, that is, in the relation between the writer and the readers. Such an investigation finds not primarily a dogmatic motif but an ethical one. The johannine ethic is a significant issue of johannine studies because this problem is one in which the dialectical relationship existing between author and community is opened up in a forceful way. Nowhere is this more evident, and more fruitful for investigation, than in the farewell discourse (chapters 13-16). This correlative factor has been largely ignored, to the detriment of contemporary johannine scholarship.

B. The Definition of the Problem

When the subject of a johannine ethic is broached, several considerations must be mentioned in the definition of the problem itself. The crucial issue for this discussion is the question whether one may properly speak of a johannine ethic and whether there are, properly speaking, ethical exhortations in the gospel at all. This concern has been forcefully presented by Martin Dibelius[5] who sought to show that terms such as "love," and "keeping the commandments," are not employed by John with the intention of conveying an ethical connotation. Dibelius argues that since for John ἀγάπη is initiated by God it is a suprahuman relation and therefore has a cosmic, metaphysical meaning. "It is not an ethical (sittliches) relation for it does not deal with any human relation."[6] It is metaphysical and therefore is pointing to the matter of Wesen.[7] Therefore, the discussion in John is concerned with theological concerns and not ethical ones. When John is viewed as a theologian who appropriates and reformulates a gnostic, dualistic, cosmological Weltanschauung then any seeming ethic disappears and in its place is an extra-worldly phenomenon in which ethic is not a meaningful category.

---

[4] E.g., Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964, and even Käsemann, whose study deals specifically with the farewell discourse, succumbs to these errors.

The question which such an analysis poses is one of methodology and definition. Ethics certainly deals with interpersonal relationships. However, German scholarship generally, it appears,[8] has discounted the ethical category wherever grace is encountered. Therefore, since God initiates the act of life the concern of the evangelist cannot be ethical. Such a stance, however, is too restrictive and misses vital problems which face the evangelist. It will be demonstrated that the ethical category does indeed play an important role in the Gospel of John, and can be a useful portal to the whole gospel.

---

[5] Martin Dibelius, "Johannes 15:13: Eine Studie zum Traditions-problem des Johannes-Evangeliums," in Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927, pp. 168-186.

[6] Ibid., p. 173.

[7] Ibid., p. 175.

A second point of difficulty in dealing with the ethical exhortations in John is the seeming vagueness and generality of the material (cf. John 13:34; 14:15, 21, 23; 15:10, 12, 17). The vocabulary used elsewhere in the New Testament to convey ethical connotations seems bereft of concrete applications and explications when used in the Fourth Gospel. Specificity, too, is lacking in John's ethical exhortations. By a few simple references to other New Testament examples, this aspect of the problem comes into sharper perspective.

---

[8] In addition to this commonly posited definition of ethics in German New Testament interpretation (e.g., also attested by Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium and E. Käsemann, Jesu letzter Wille), such an interpretation is also portrayed in theology. D. Bonhoeffer, in his Ethics, also raises the question whether one can talk about a Christian ethic since the premise of the Christian obligation rests on the revelatory commandments of God. It is therefore a suprahuman relationship and not simply a human one; therefore, it is questionable whether one may properly call it an ethic. Cf. the section of his Ethics entitled "The 'Ethical' and the 'Christian' as a Theme," especially pp. 263-285 where the relationship of ethic to the commandment of God is discussed (Ethics, trans. by Neville Horton Smith, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965).

In the synoptic tradition, Luke provides an interesting contrast to John in this regard. John 13:34 or 15:17 simply state the command: ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους . No elaborate explication of what this means in conduct is detailed. However, when Luke includes the command to ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν (6:27) there follows an elaborate and specific list of examples providing an adequate delineation of the command: to the one who strikes you on one cheek, offer him the other; to the one who would take your coat, give him your coat; give to the one who begs from you; do to others as you would have them do to you (6:28-31). Following these examples there appears the antithesis of those who love only those who love in return (6:32-34) with a condemnation of them for risking nothing. The elaboration is completed with a return to the original command to love one's enemies (6:35-36).[9]

The epistolary literature also abounds with examples of the specificity which John seems to lack. In the letter to the Romans, Paul exhorts: ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος (12:9). This appeal is specified by a list of exhortations which make explicit the first statement (12:9b-21): hate evil, love one another and the enemy, rejoice with those who rejoice and weep with those who weep, control haughtiness and conceit, associate with the lowly, feed the enemy, etc.[10]

---

[9] Other passages where Luke explicates the exhortation in a similar fashion include: 3:7-14; 9:23-26; 11:5-13; 18:18-30.

[10] Other examples of this in Paul include: Ro. 13; 14 Phil. 2:5-18; Gal. 5:13ff.; I Thess. 4.

These examples highlight the uniqueness of the johannine material. It would appear that John is either unconcerned with details in his ethical exhortations;[11] or else he is plotting a different course entirely, perhaps using such terms in a metaphysical or theological sense rather than an ethical one.[12] In either respect, the exhortations themselves form a barrier to an easy explanation or interpretation. / Therefore, precisely because of the enigmatic nature of the johannine formulations they must be put in the larger context of the structure of the Fourth Gospel.

One introductory issue remains concerning the correct nomenclature to be given to that material involved. The terminology is important for setting the problem of the johannine ethic in proper perspective. It is important to be aware that the material to be investigated is not properly to be called paraenetical. In an illuminating study, Victor Furnish has carefully delineated the scope of paraenesis. Following the suggestions set forth by Dibelius in his Jakobusbrief, and illuminated by his own investigation of the history of this ethical, educative form called paraenesis in classical and hellenistic culture, Furnish summarizes the scope of paraenesis: "The essence of a paraenesis . . . is its character as a collection of old wisdom; it is an anthology of accepted advice, a summation of what, upon reflection, is obvious to all."[13] With such a precise definition in mind, one may not properly apply the term paraenesis to all types of ethical exhortation. Because of the technical nature of the term, the broader category of "ethical exhortation" has been chosen to represent inclusively the subject matter to be investigated in John. Many researchers still employ the term paraenesis as a general category for John's ethical material;[14] however such nomenclature is likely to confuse the issue at hand. The exhortations in John are not intended as a collection of old wisdom or generally valid paraenesis. Under such a rubric, only a few verses of the material to be investigated would be of that character (e.g., 15:13; 13:16) where such wisdom is used in developing exhortation directed to the johannine community. John uses these gnomic pieces in his paracletic structure which is evidenced in the farewell discourse. He is not intending to pass on extensive lists of old wisdom or paraenesis as James, for example, has done. His exhortations are directed to the portentious times of the community. His material, therefore, is paracletic and not paraenetic, derived as a response to the times themselves and not representative of a pattern for educative purposes. John's ethic, like Paul's, is not a closely worked out ethic of a general and all embracing sort, but is a cry directed to the days of immediate turmoil. Thus, the general category distinguishing the johannine ethic is paracletic rather than paraenetical.[15]

---

[11] Lazure, for example, thinks that John did not get more specific in order to leave the Christian individual free to respond to the various situations which would arise (N. Lazure, Les valeurs morales de la théologie johannique, Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1965).

[12] As Dibelius would contend, for example.

---

[13] Victor Paul Furnish, Paul's Exhortations in the Context of His Letters and Thought, Dissertation at Yale University, New Haven, 1960, p. 4. (Also discussed in his book Theology and Ethics in Paul, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968, p. 91.) In concert with this definition is M. Dibelius, Der Brief des Jakobus, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959, who says: "Paraenesis eignet a certain intentionality and interconfessionality, for ethical imperative does not always need to be expressed in the service of the faith in which it stands," (p. 19).

[14] E.g., Lazure, Bultmann.

C. The Contemporary Studies of the Johannine Ethic

With these introductory remarks in mind, it is helpful to review what scholars say about the johannine ethic. It is readily apparent that few researchers have agonized at any length over this problem. O. Prunet suggests that the subject has not been treated extensively for the basic reason that, whereas the synoptics can be divided somewhat easily into the religious, theological category and the moral category, the Gospel of John cannot. In John these two categories appear as one.[16] A more adequate and inclusive reason why the subject has been given little attention is found in the approach given priority in the interpretation of John's gospel.

---

[15] The function is identical to the pauline ethical exhortations as they have been distinguished by Furnish, Paul's Exhortations, esp. p. 379; cf. 359.

[16] O. Prunet, La morale chrétienne d'après les 'écrits johanniques, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957, p. v.

Rudolf Bultmann

The man most representative, in this regard, is Bultmann, whose work stands at the center of current johannine discussions.

Bultmann argues in his Theology of the New Testament that the central concern of the Gospel of John is the Word become flesh.[17] The Revealer, sent by God, has come to the world in human form. He presents to the world his claim of authority and demands "that the world surrender the understanding it had of itself hitherto; that it let the whole structure of its security which it has erected in presumptuous independence of the Creator fall to ruins."[18] "Faith," according to John, "is the overcoming of the offence--the offence that life meets man only in the word addressed to him by a mere man--Jesus of Nazareth."[19]

John's gospel provides a focal point, alongside Paul, of Bultmann's existential categories and thus presents a word for man qua man as to his possibilities for authentic or inauthentic life. Bultmann's Johannes-Evangelium pursues this basic interpretation with intricate exactitude. By such an approach, Bultmann affords only peripheral glances at the historical situation of the community to whom John writes. Because of his christological-theological interests he is not concerned with the exegencies of the community as it struggles for its own continuation. Since he does not take seriously the situation to which the gospel was addressed, he pays no regard to the question of ethics. The Word blots out the ethical question.

---

[17] Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, p. 33.

[18] Ibid., p. 75.

[19] Ibid.

Such a brief summary does not remove Bultmann's work on John from consideration in this study, as will be evident throughout. But it does show that, from the standpoint of the thesis presented here, his approach to the johannine gospel needs to be discarded in favor of a different methodology and a different understanding of the thrust of John's gospel. This is to reiterate, historical-ethical categories are more adequate for interpreting this gospel than are theological ones.

The four figures who are discussed below are those of contemporary scholarship who have sought to deal specifically with the ethic question of John in some depth.[20] Their studies are presented chronologically. From the summaries of these views may arise the spring-board from which the methodological presuppositions of this disquisition may be presented. The brief critiques accompanying each review are given to anticipate the methodological considerations which form the background for the argument to be developed in the main body.

---

[20] This is to exclude for the time being the individually illuminating studies done on specific aspects of the johannine ethic. Concentration here will be on those studies which have sought to give a broadly conceived overview of the johannine ethic. The other studies will obviously be considered in the following chapters of the dissertation.

Hans Joachim Wachs

The first extensive study of the johannine ethic was a dissertation in 1952 by H. J. Wachs.[21] The basic material analyzed by Wachs included all of the johannine literature apart from the Apocalypse; therefore, the study attempts a general reconstruction of a johannine position which is removed from any specific situation for which the writings were originally intended. Although he did perceive that the situation could be crucial for an understanding of the johannine ethic under certain conditions, he did not pursue the matter. He accedes that if brother love is a shrinking of the general use of agape, and therefore restricted, it would have to be explained by a specific and concrete situation. Since he was interested in a general look at the johannine ethic, derived from the theological system, he did not see any reason to pursue such a possibility.[22]

Wachs defines ethics in John as doing the will of God. He contends that there is an evident ethical relation in the Gottgleichsein of the Christian.[23] The conclusions of the study all follow from this basic definition. For

---

[21] H. J. Wachs, Johanneische Ethik, Dissertation at the University of Kiel, 1952.

[22] Ibid., p. 58.

[23] Ibid., pp. 4, 16. Also p. 35: "The subject of ethic is the being and action of the man under the judgment of God.

Wachs, the ethic of John is a theological ethic, i.e., everything in the ethic follows from a theological deduction. God stands behind Jesus and gives the gift of life to man through Jesus. In turn, as God's only revealer, Jesus is the source of life in the community. Because there is a qualitative difference between God-Jesus and man, Jesus serves as an *Urbild* of what agape means. Jesus is not a mere earthly example which men follow in imitation. On the contrary, Jesus is the ground through which divine agape is revealed to men at all. Therefore, the agape of man is a gift and a possibility only because it has been revealed. Such is not a human quality in John because there is a qualitative distinction between the Godly life and the existence of the world. The heathen, those living by the standards of the world, do not have agape. Once this relationship of God to man is understood, one may say that faith does suppose, as one of its essential aspects, the following (*Nachfolge*) of Christ which means διακονεῖν .[24] It is a being-there for others and it is completed only with the concrete brother love. The johannine ethic does consumate in an ἔργον ,[25] which is the love of one's brother and that is an integral part of faith. However, what a work is may appropriately be classified only as a substratum of the theological referent God. This overcomes the danger of viewing a work as an act instituted by man. A work is merely the natural outgrowth of the initiation by God himself.[26]

---

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 20

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

When Wachs turns to the understanding of brother-love in John he takes issue with Bousset and Gressmann, Bauer, and Windisch and their common conclusion that brother-love is restricted in John to the comrades in faith.[27] The fact that love can appear objectless at times (e.g., I John 3:14), provides an important insight into the way love as brother-love ought to be surveyed. Wachs contends that brother-love is the Voraussentzung and not the goal and highest form of love. Since the johannine correspondence wishes to bring others to faith, such an exclusiveness of the community would be incoherent. For Wachs, the term opposing brother-love is not love of enemy but is rather brother-hate[28] --which is to say that what John appeals for is love even within the community. This shows that communal discord is a concern for the evangelist. The Jews had a restrictive brother-love bound to the comrades in faith, and the gnostics had such a restriction as well with their concern for the elements of light. But John is on a different level and is to be regarded as being all inclusive in his command. If John's ethic were restrictive, Wachs suggests, a concrete situation would be needed to account for it. Such a suggestion is precisely what Wachs needed to follow up but did not.

---

[26] Ibid., p. 26, where the growth in fruit bearing is conceived as a growth in love. This is, in turn, God's work and not man's.

[27] Ibid., p. 57. His references are to W. Bousset und H. Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926; W. Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933; and H. Windisch, Die katholischen Briefe, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1930.

[28] Ibid., p. 61. On p. 63 Wachs affirms in like manner: "The command not to love the world is not the negative side of the command of brother-love."

The newness of John's ethic (e.g., καινὴ ἐντολή) rests on the eschatological, qualitative difference initiated with God's revelation in Jesus. Therefore, in John a radical distinction is drawn between commandment and law. The latter is associated with the religion of Judaism, whereas commandment relates to the faith made possible through Jesus. In this distinction, too, John shows that his ethic is not a mere fulfilling of written or stated legal sentences but is tied to a creative being, living for the neighbor. It is not a mere accomplishment of men but it is a response made under faith before the judgment of God.

The basic failure of Wachs' study is his neglect of the situation of the community to which the evangelist writes. Because this subject is merely broached but not explored by Wachs, several distortions are inherent to the study. The ethic grounded and defined by theological and christological arguments fails to apprehend the vital influence of concrete happenings. Wachs' theological exclusivism, as it might be called, yields a situationless composition of general Christian truths which distorts the intention of the evangelist. Likewise, this exclusivism solves too easily crucial considerations such as the emphatic ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους , and other restrictive terminology. Further, by including in his discussion all of the johannine literature as one category, without consideration for possible 1) different authors, or 2) different situations and contexts, Wachs has generalized a subject which demands investigation of specific life situations in relation to the text.

Olivier Prunet

Olivier Prunet's study of the johannine ethic is founded on two encompassing methodological presuppositions. The first is a decidedly existential stance toward the subject matter. The second is the grounding of the ethic in John's theology and christology. It is significant, as well, that Prunet employs the total johannine corpus in the study and calls often on I John to buttress his case. This observation is important since by drawing upon the total corpus it is possible to distort the particular, as Wachs has done. Also, by drawing generally from the theological vocabulary of the Fourth Gospel Prunet has sought to deduce the johannine ethic from the theological norms which appear. This, too, overlooks the important factor of the community and its situation.

Prunet's analysis proceeds from an existentialistic, anthropological stance. Such a beginning point is stated most dramatically in his discussion of the moral vocabulary in John's gospel. In remarking on the terms φῶς -- σκοτία ; ἀλήθεια -- ψεῦδος ; ἐλευθερία -- δουλεία , and ζωή -- θάνατος, Prunet contends that these dualistic terms are not to be taken in a cosmological sense, but rather as presentations of the innate, anthropological possibilities of man qua man. In these essentially ethical terms, man is viewed as one who can follow the light or darkness, one who can be free or be a slave. "In johannine thought the notion of nature is devalued to the advantage of that of the attitude. . . . Truth and falsehood contribute in defining the two spheres which encompass the only two possible modes of life."[29] It thus seems apparent that Prunet envisions johannine anthropology in a way similar to that of Bultmann.[30] His emphasis upon an existential appropriation of the ethical possibilities controls his entire discussion.

The second working presupposition of Prunet's study, even more important for the study of John's ethic, is the grounding of the johannine ethic in theology and christology. Taking Prunet at his word, the Gospel of John is theocentric. The work of Jesus has its origin in God, its model and impetus; therefore, Jesus himself demands a theocentricism.[31]

---

[29] La morale chrétienne, pp. 8-9.

[30] Bultmann's statements concerning anthropology come forth clearly in his Theology of the New Testament, trans. by Kendrick Grobel, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955, especially the section on pauline anthropology in Vol. 1, and as well in the essay "Man Between the Times in the New Testament," Existence and Faith, trans. by Schubert Ogden, New York: Meridian Books, 1960, pp. 248-266.

[31] Prunet, La morale chrétienne, pp. 30-31.

The johannine ethic is an ethic of grace, coming from the father; and since all action is ultimately rooted in him, theocentricism is the key for the proper interpretation of John. Because of the noted emphasis on Jesus as the only revealer of God, there is, accordingly, a strong christological accent likewise evident.

Given these two guiding suppositions, Prunet thinks that John's ethical thought cannot be isolated, as can such thinking in the synoptics and in the pauline literature.[32] Therefore, his choice of the terms to be discussed as the johannine "moral vocabulary" is drawn from the most theologically involved terminology in the gospel.

Φῶς, for example, is the symbol used for "the intelligibility for man of his own existence."[33] It expresses the quality of man's conscience and his existential devenir. Thus, to be in the light is to recognize God as God, which in turn procures for man an understanding of himself as creature.[34] Σκοτία , on the other hand, expresses the end to that reality which φῶς illuminates. In turn, ἀλήθεια , prepared for by man's natural and spontaneous love for the truth, is the revealed truth which corresponds to φῶς ; and ψεῦδος , contrariwise, is man trusting in himself and forgetting the divine reality.[35] Continuing this existential dualism, John views ζωή not as life in and of itself but as that understanding which sees life as revealed and grounded in the actuality of Christ. "It (life) does not put the believer in relation to any metaphysical idea or any suprahistorical being, but it subdues him to the commands of Jesus (keep his word, be friends with him, remain in his love, like as he likes), and to recall the events of the earthly life of Jesus."[36]

---

[32] Ibid., p. v.

[33] Ibid., p. 2.

[34] Ibid., p. 4.

[35] Ibid., pp. 5-7.

The dualistic vocabulary informs the anthropological setting of the johannine theology, and, according to Prunet, it provides the basis upon which one can talk about ethics in John. This vocabulary sets forth the broad possibilities in which man lives--or does not live, as the case may be--his existence.

It is from the christological and theological premises that Prunet develops the interpretation of the johannine ethic as that of a servant ethic. But in doing that he becomes involved in the issues of the historical Jesus in John, and he never sufficiently takes account of that problem. In the section entitled "The Moral Aspect of the Christology," he asserts that in John the traits of the "moral personality of Christ" become clear: "The sonship of Jesus designates less a unity of nature than a unity of will 'with the father'"[37] (the unity with the father "est avant tout une unité morale: unité d'affection, d'activité, de fins pouissuivies").[38] As the perfect servant, at one with the will of the father, Jesus exhibits the highest moral qualities: "Profound humility, total abnegation, patience in acceptance of the accusations, uprightness in failure, courage, fearlessness, humility, perfect confidence in God. All the virtues of the humanity of Jesus--and virtues in the fullest sense of that term--are concentrated around the idea of service."[39]

---

[36] *Ibid.*, p. 12. [37] *Ibid.*, p. 41. [38] *Ibid.*

These statements show the direction in which Prunet moves. For John, so Prunet argues, the earthly Jesus serves as a paraenetical model for the ethical action of the disciples. Accordingly, Prunet suggests in reference to the new birth of man under Christ," his new existence is developed in the imitation of Christ in whom, in principle, it has already been rendered visible."[40] And further, "The new life is a constant reference to the historical life of Christ which serves as a model for him (man) and to the actual action of Christ which inspires him."[41] To be sure, Prunet contends that this is not simply a paradigmatic christology in which Jesus serves merely as a model,[42] a model which could be replaced by another. Rather, it is precisely because Jesus is the Christ, the resurrected one, that the love of Jesus continues to serve as a present reality and as a present grounding of love. Jesus continues as the life giving force ever anew among the believers. Yet, in spite of this explanatory statement, the work of Prunet relies heavily on the moral qualities of Jesus' life and the ethic of John is viewed as a call for men to imitate the actions of the earthly Jesus. Thus, Prunet's position points in the direction of an essentially paradigmatic christological ethic in John.

---

[39] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

[40] Ibid., p. 86.

[41] Ibid., p. 88.

[42] Ibid., p. 100.

The new life which emerges from the confrontation with the revealer is a life in which agape is the central and motivating factor. The roots of this love are in the historical Jesus, but it is an open ended commandment in John, with the implications for specific action left open. Although John uses the expression "love one another," Prunet thinks that this is not a communal exclusivism but really expresses the same thought as the love for the enemies which is found in the synoptics.[43] The ethic of the community which stands in the new life is one of service to the will of God revealed to them in the service of Christ. The community's response in love is grounded and sustained by the gift of God and is therefore to be termed "une éthique de la grâce."[44]

Three problems are left unsettled by Prunet's study. The first is an attempt to view John's gospel as a theological exercise, standing entirely on the theological system constructed by John. This approach simply fails to consider the situation to which that theology was directed. In fact, there are significant sections in the gospel where such motivations are evident, for example, the farewell discourse, and such ought to be explored for their possible bearing on the ethical and theological formulations of the gospel. Also, by attempting to exude a totally theological, systematic approach to the johannine ethic, Prunet has put emphasis on terms which do not carry the ethical weight he ascribes to them (which is not to say they do not have any ethical value), e.g., φῶς--ἀλήθεια, etc. As important as these terms might be in the Gospel of John, they do not constitute the proper point of departure for the johannine ethic.

---

[43] Ibid., p. 115.

[44] Ibid., p. 44.

Second, Prunet's attempt at an overall view of the johannine ethic by bringing to bear the letters as well as the gospel has hindered his grasp of the situational character of the johannine ethic. By concentrating on a specific context, such as the farewell discourse, a quite different emphasis to John's ethic becomes evident.

Third, one must ask whether Prunet can legitimately base the johannine ethic upon the works and moral qualities of the historical Jesus. This, along with the paradigmatic christology must be discussed in more detail later.

Rudolf Schnackenburg

In his book, *The Moral Teaching of the New Testament*, Rudolf Schnackenburg devotes one lengthy chapter to the study of the johannine ethic. He too draws upon all of the johannine literature, apart from the Apocalypse, as the subject matter for his consideration.

The guiding factor which Schnackenburg emphasizes is the utter christological interest of John as opposed to the theological emphasis of the synoptics. All of the johannine theology centers in the explication of the redemptive work of Christ, and the johannine ethic is both anchored here and is an extension from that figure.

A second characteristic of Schnackenburg's study is the rejection of a moral individualism or an existential ethic. The emphasis is upon the church as an essential ingredient of the johannine theology and ethic. The church is the body of believers in which the regulative ethical influences find their provenance and their hearing.

Since Schnackenburg's study is only one part of a total work, it might be expected that his analysis would be much more general than was Wachs' or Prunet's. Specific references to vocabulary, etc. are less common. He justifies his broad conclusions by contending that for John there was little concern for specific instruction; "but there is a gain in comprehensive vision of principles and this is to the advantage of the picture of the world and of man, the understanding of reality and of salvation."[45] The johannine ethic is grounded in the christological emphasis of the gospel which, in turn, is set in a dualism of the world and God. The dualism of John is not a cosmological one; rather it is

---

[45] R. Schnackenburg, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, trans. by J. Holland-Smith and W. J. O'Hara, New York: Herder and Herder, 1965, p. 308.

"historical" in essence.[46] That is to say, the world has, due to its own decision, turned away from God to evil. The figure of Christ is that historical possibility for man to turn back to the φῶς by his own moral decision.[47] Redemption is not deterministic wherein all men are brought back to the light; rather, the moral decision counts. Thus, "belief" in Christ and "doing the truth" (taken as moral stances by Schnackenburg) are closely linked, and the command of love points to the "obligation of all religious endeavor to authenticate itself by pure moral action."[48] Christology is soteriology and is at the same moment ethical action. Because Jesus loved the disciples, they are also to love the brothers with a love which is "completely unselfish, generous, merciful, and seeking the salvation of others."[49] Such a neat summary has the same dangers as Prunet's in that it seeks to generalize vague references in the gospel into an encompassing blanket of moral terms.

Even though Schnackenburg states that the moral commandments are summed up not in the double commandment to love God and one's neighbors but rather in the new commandment to love the brothers alone,[50] he is unwilling to take this seriously enough to say that this limits one's love to that of the group. The call to love the brothers is merely a universal sign of the children of God in contrast to the world of hate. John merely points to the community of the brothers in the faith and does not seek to give a limited definition to the extension of love, except to say that apart from the community itself love does not now exist.[51]

---

[46] Ibid., p. 310.

[47] Ibid., p. 311.

[48] Ibid., p. 313.

[49] Ibid., p. 327.

[50] Ibid., p. 322.

At this juncture Schnackenburg proceeds to a short discussion of the importance of the church in John, and it is here that some of the most exciting suggestions of the study are made. In the farewell discourse light is shed on the picture of the church as understood by John. Here emerges the image of the Paraclete leading the community with the church as the branches of the vine. In addition, Schnackenburg notes the references to the worshipping community in 2:21 and 4:23, and he attempts to show that the sacraments help to constitute the church.[52] The context of the church provides yet more information. It is clear that "the johannine church is engaged in a hard defensive struggle, but it also possesses an unconquerable sense of victory as is shown by the repetition of 'we know.'"[53] The situation of the church is noted, but too briefly to know whether or not Schnackenburg wants to advance anything by that reference.

---

[51] _Ibid._, pp. 323-328.

[52] No exact reference is given by Schnackenburg for this suggestion, but most likely he refers to the sections of 6:1ff. and 15:1ff. which are often so interpreted.

[53] _Ibid._, p. 325.

It is obvious that the communal situation does not influence Schnackenburg's general understanding of the johannine ethic.

The major question to be asked of Schnackenburg is whether or not the theological-christological emphasis, which the Gospel of John obviously displays, is the proper beginning for an investigation of John's ethical thinking. It is true that Schnackenburg admits the church, as a community, to the realm of final regulator of ethical action for John, as opposed to the existentialistic moral response of Prunet, but his discussion still does not admit the community as an active partner in the creation of John's gospel. So, the community still has a passive role in Schnackenburg's treatment of John.

One insight of this short study, which Schnackenburg does not attempt to follow through, is his statement that strictly speaking the moral commandments are summed up, and executed, not in a command to love God and neighbor (as with the synoptics), "But in the new commandment to love the brethren alone."[54] This would seem to suggest that, as with Prunet's analysis, the love of God (objective genitive) is completely fulfilled only in the love of the brother. Is this possibly to say that moral action alone expresses theological belief; or, to put it another way, is belief only belief if it is expressed in response to the brother? This question is a decisive one for this dissertation and will be dealt with indirectly throughout the paper.

---

[54] Ibid., pp. 323-328.

Noel Lazure

The study of the johannine ethic by N. Lazure depends upon those studies already mentioned. Lazure's is a much more extensive work and covers the areas mentioned in connection with the first three works in much more detail.

Lazure's study begins with the basic supposition that the foundation of the johannine ethic is *l'économie du salut*. The salvation history itself is the framework of the Gospel of John, and the norm of John's ethic is the event of Jesus. Jesus' revelation stands at the center of history and that revelation continues in the time of the church with the holy spirit. Thus, once again, christology is placed at the forefront, and all ethical exhortations and confrontations find their place in the person of Jesus. As the revealer, Jesus is *the* representative of the new eschatological age. Jesus, as Son of Man, is "true man, ideal man: his relation to God is the archtype of the true relation of man to God. He represents regenerated humanity."[55]

However, Lazure is not setting forth a paradigmatic christology. Having made the claim for Jesus, Lazure continues by centering on the sacramental nature of the Christian's relation to Jesus. The Christian does not look upon Jesus as a mere model. On the contrary, he is called to participate *in* Jesus and to remain *in* him. This is not a call to remain in a union based on love, but the "remaining in" Jesus is made possible by the eucharist.[56] The union is sacramental and ontic in nature. The disciple of Christ becomes a "new being" ontologically speaking. It is ontically that the Christians resemble Jesus and they love like he does because they are of the same nature. Jesus remains the focal point, sent by God and one with him metaphysically. The disciple is called to join this metaphysical nature as well. Only when the disciple participates in *l'économie du salut* does his ethical act have any ultimate meaning. One remains in Christ and is able to bear fruit by eating Christ's flesh and blood. The historical Jesus, the bringer of salvation and the new age, is the truth, and when he proclaims ἐγώ εἰμι he is not speaking metaphorically but ontologically and this is a call for the disciple to remain in him and his work. A sacramental christology, then, is the basis of the johannine ethic.[57] In this respect, Lazure is basically at one with Schnackenburg. Prunet, it will be recalled, argues that the ethic is grounded in a union of wills, basically an existential response between Jesus and his disciples, but it was not one of ontic union.

---

[55] Lazure, *Les valeurs morales*, p. 19, n. 20.

Having discussed the basis for the johannine ethic, Lazure then moves to a presentation of the form of that ethic. Lazure observes that a very important part of this matter is found in the farewell discourse. Here one finds material which is comparable to the didactic teachings of the synoptics and letters, as opposed to an emphasis on kerygmatic material. Lazure states, "the farewell discourse, presented in an exhortatory or paraenetic style, is illuminated by the light of the passages of the New Testament which pertain to didache."[58] Although Lazure does not limit his discussion of John's ethic to these chapters, he recognizes the importance of them for a construction of the ethic. It is in this section that the constructions which could be called ethical, i.e., keep the commandments, love one another, bear fruit, etc., illuminate and play a significant role in the development of the thoughts of the gospel as a whole.

---

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[57] *Ibid.*, pp. 70-72.

Another perception of Lazure is his recognition of the importance of the church context for the ethic of John. The church in John is conceived as a community of "brothers" (20:17), of free sons of the word of God who are possessed by the Spirit of God, and are those who live under the regime of the new community of love (13:34).[59] The picture of the church shows a time of crisis,[60] a time when man, in his existential decision must resolve the tension existing between the co-existence of terrestrial and celestial reality. Man must decide for one or the other of these realities. He who decides entirely for God decides for a total relation of brother to brother in the context of the redemptive event of Jesus Christ. He decides to participate in the total victory of Christ over worldly existence.[61] In this context the individual's life is intimately tied to an imitation of Jesus, for his total life then becomes one of _dévouement_ for his brothers. Such a self-giving is made possible by participation in Christ, effected by the Spirit, which is a participation in the love which Jesus communicates to the _interior_ person.[62] It is the context of the church, the _Elu du Seigneur_, which is the arena of the johannine ethic. This is not to limit action merely to the community to the exclusion of the world,[63] but it is to show the context from which action is motivated and produced.

---

[58] Ibid., p. 126. [59] Ibid., p. 40.

[60] This is, unfortunately, the only statement which Lazure proffers concerning the historical situation of the church community in John. He makes no further elaboration of this.

With these suppositions in view, Lazure centers his attention on the ethical commandments found in John. Lazure wants to go beyond the tendency to reduce the johannine commandments to faith (Bultmann) or faith and love (Schnackenburg). These are likely the fundamental commandments, but there are others, including: doing justice, doing the truth and good, following the will of God, following the savior, adoring the father in spirit and truth, remaining in God and Jesus.[64] The commandments are eternal life. But having made this summary, Lazure then attempts to account for the fact that the johannine precepts are not elucidated to any extent. He calls this the universal character of the johannine commandments.

---

[61] _Ibid._, p. 57.

[62] _Ibid._, pp. 155-157. The reference to the _interior_ person is an attempt to dissociate the inner change which takes place when a man is given life by Christ and any outer manifestation of that change. It is unlikely, however, that John made any such distinction.

[63] _Ibid._, p. 232. Lazure contends that love of neighbor has nothing to do with the exclusive nature of religion. It is metaphysically conceived in John and it applies, therefore, only to the love of God's own. It is found only within the church because only there is God truly known.

> In them we rarely find a prescription which aludes to a precise act to be applied to specific circumstances. The _entolai_ remain open to a series of implied actions in their observance, whether having to do with love, belief, adoration of the father, prayer in the name of the son, marching in the truth. They are presented in John not under the implication of a minimum to be realized but as an ideal to follow, a way in which they ought to engage, a mode of life seizing all of a person and are to be incorporated in the most varied situations in the life of a disciple. The universal character does not in any way diminish their obligatory force; they are exacting all the more since they can control all of life.[65]

This quotation affords a good summary of Lazure's position. The exhortations of John are left quite broad, with no specific explications of the commandments in order that the individual Christian might take the initiative in applying them to his own life within the community. Lazure is, at the same time, wanting to say that the commands are not exterior commandments, which can simply be fulfilled to the letter. On the contrary, John is talking about the _interior_ character of the commandment. The commandment penetrates to the heart of the man who is a new being and because the man himself is totally changed he is then able to appropriate the quite general commandment to his own situation. The emphasis of Lazure is thus placed on the inner revelation to man and not on the observable action as such. To take a specific example, agape is such a general commandment. Lazure admits that agape has primarily a religious value for John, intimately bound with the history of salvation. Love is a gift from God and it is to be appropriated by man. Indeed, John is the only gospel writer to attach the qualification of brotherly love. But that does not counteract the observation that John neglects giving any specific rules as to how one should go about loving; rather, agape is an interior gift the application of which is unnamable, indefinite, and universal in nature.[66] Love is commanded, but how one follows through on that depends on individual cases into which John does not venture.

---

[64] _Ibid_., p. 140.

[65] _Ibid_., p. 143.

Lazure's study is broad in scope and shows insight and suggestiveness at several points. By observing the essential role of the community in his discussion of the johannine ethic he has advanced beyond mere consideration of theological terminology and has initiated an attempt at a "method of correlation." However, his outcome is not satisfactory. The sacramental ethic which he envisions strains the evidence too much and distorts the meaning of community as signified by the evangelist.[67] And from this sacramental supposition a real interplay of the Sitz-im-Leben of the community with the theological expression of the author fails to materialize. Finally, because such discussion of the communal situation in the world is not taken seriously the real theological problems for the evangelist and community, which center in the problem underlying christology, remain invisible.

---

[66] _Ibid_., p. 231.

[67] Sacramental in this case is tied directly to the eucharist. Whether or not John includes reference to the

Summary

The summary of these four attempts at reconstructing the essential features of the johannine ethic reflects the overriding concern of contemporary scholarship to ground the johannine ethic within the johannine theological system. However, such a procedure is inadequate and precarious. Methodologically it is weak because it fails to observe the vital component of the method of correlation which has informed the writing of the gospel. In contradistinction to the previous studies, the point of departure for an investigation of the johannine ethic, and theology, must be a serious confrontation of the interplay between churchly situation and the accompanying theological-ethical response by John. Even though an analysis of the Sitz-im-Leben of the community to which John writes is admittedly difficult and any result

---

sacraments (especially at 15:1ff) is questionable and certainly Lazure's emphasis on that goes beyond probability. The whole question of the sacramental elements or nature of the Fourth Gospel is quite complicated and must be answered by an analysis of the text (e.g., 6:52-58) as well as by an adequate definition of sacramental.

is likely to be problematic, the risk of reconstruction of that situation must be taken in order to be fair to the intention of the evangelist. Theology and christology do not exist in a vacuum unaltered by events. The question to be answered in a study of any biblical theology, and John's theology in particular, must be: how is the tradition informed by the situation of the readers and, hence, reformed by the evangelist in order to respond to that circumstance? A correlation of the historical setting of the community and the theological-ethical reflections of the evangelist has occurred and that correlation must be examined.

Failure to investigate the communal circumstances as a basic key to the johannine ethic exposes another weakness in the studies reviewed above. Generally, commentators of the johannine ethic have found a priori evidence and support for their conclusions from both the gospel and the letters of John. Such exegeses are likely to be deceptive, however. On the one hand they presuppose that a writer is a systematic theologian and that all of his writings will support each other. Given such a supposition, the arguments of John will all tend to support each other. This approach, however, is likely to overlook significant differences in the historical circumstances which led to the composition of two distinctly different modes of writing, a gospel form and a letter form. Flexibility toward different historical contexts is therefore lost in a systematic approach and it should, therefore, be avoided as the first step in interpreting John's ethic.

Such a systematic and generalizing position also must presuppose that both writings, John's gospel and John's letters, were authored by the same individual, and that conclusion is still tenuous, if not incorrect.[68]

D. The Methodological Procedure of the Study

In light of these contentions, the argument of this dissertation will proceed differently. In order to avoid these pitfalls, the Gospel of John will be analyzed on its own merits and in consideration of the situation which evoked the writing of the gospel. A basic study of John's ethic should consider first the gospel in isolation.

Even with the decision to limit the study of the Gospel of John to the importance of correlation between communal situation and the evangelist's response to that situation, there is a second matter which must be determined. A decision must be made as to the proper starting point for such a study of the gospel. Previous studies of the johannine ethic have drawn from all parts of the gospel equally for their conclusions. Such exegesis presupposes that all parts of the gospel are equally significant for the exposition of the ethic. However, that supposition must be questioned for it overlooks the importance of form for the evangelist. The farewell discourse is the most appropriate place from which to launch an investigation because there the form itself points to the exhortatory appeal of the evangelist and it is there that the dialogue between communal situation and the evangelist most forcefully discloses itself. It remains to be demonstrated, of course, whether or not the chapters of the farewell discourse do in fact offer an identifiable ethic.

---

[68] Debate has certainly not stopped on this issue. The most notable study which raised serious doubts to the common authorship of the two works was C. H. Dodd's "The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," BJRL 21 (April, 1937), pp. 129ff. Dodd stressed the different vocabulary and the style of I John from that of the Gospel of John. Haenchen has taken up Dodd's suggestions and laid heavy stress on the different use of prepositions as decisive ("Neuere Literatur zu den Johannesbriefen: A," ThR, N.F. 26 (1960), p. 1ff). Conzelmann contends that the difference is inherent in the fact that I John appears to view the Gospel of John as already tradition ("Was von Anfang war," Beiheft to ZNW 21 (1954), pp. 194ff.). The list of scholars who attest the different authorship of the two works, as quoted by Kümmel in his Introduction to the New Testament is quite lengthy: Moffatt, Dibelius, Goguel, Windisch, Wilder, Dodd, McNeile-Williams, Klijn, Bultmann, Conzelmann, and Haenchen (cf. p. 311).

Third, because there has been such a massive amount of scholarly material relating to the construction, make-up, and possible sources of the Gospel of John, it might be of value to offer a brief statement as to who "John," or the evangelist, is as it is used throughout this dissertation. This is intended to be not a biographical question but one of composition: at what stage of the final product which is possessed is the evangelist himself to be found? Even though what follows is briefly summarized it reflects a large part of the presuppositions of this study.

As a point of departure it is worthwhile to quote

Barrett, who has summarized well the composition of the gospel:

> Neither displacement theories nor redaction theories are needed to explain the present state of the gospel, in which certain roughnesses undoubtedly remain, together with an undoubted impression of a vigorous unity of theme. It is not for nothing that the image of the 'seamless robe' was applied by Strauss to the gospel itself. It shows a genuine unity of language and style, which is no more than the outward expression of an inward unity of thought and purpose; but this unity was imposed upon material drawn in the first place from a variety of sources, and composed, it may be, over a fairly considerable period.[69]

John is he who has worked together the gospel as it is now possessed. Even though certain pericopae might yet need to be explained as having come from the hand of a redactor (e.g., 6:58ff.), yet, even so, the gospel as a whole is a single construction. The key question is, certainly, what sort of traditions has the evangelist utilized in producing his gospel? This is a most difficult question since, as Ruckstuhl and others have shown,[70] the literary style and vocabulary are quite consistent and uniform. Thus, John has reworked sources into *a* literary work. Either that, or the material which John employed was already worked into a language which was quite in line with John's own way of expression. Certainly those sayings which have much in common with sayings found in the synoptic accounts are best explained, because of their context and accompanying language, by pointing to an independent tradition, most likely oral, which came down to John and his community.[71]

---

[69] C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to John*, London: S. P. C. K., 1958, p. 20.

[70] E. Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des johannesevangeliums*, Freiburg: Paulusverlag, 1951.

This summary concerned with a description of the "evangelist" is, to be sure, incomplete. Yet, it should provide an overview as to a presupposition behind this work: that the gospel can be legitimately canvassed as a unity, even if text and form must still be examined and scrutinized for possible pre-johannine or post-johannine clues as to authentic johannine thought.

E. The Outline of the Study

The movement of this dissertation is established in order to deal fairly with the historical questions underlying the writing of the Gospel of John, in so far as they may be ferreted out, and the response to those circumstances by the evangelist. One of the presuppositions contained therein is that the farewell discourse opens up the context of the writing. Chapter 2 will explore the questions of urgency arising from that last testament. Such an analysis makes clear that a situation of persecution looms over the evangelist and his readers. The situation can best be viewed by a look first at that section which best portrays such: 15:18-16:4a. With the vividness of that section in mind the remainder of chapter 16 can be correctly placed in its appropriate context. Once those chapters are examined the analysis of chapters 13:-15:17 aids in opening up the overall structure of the farewell discourse as affording a view of the situation confronting the community. Not only is persecution at issue, but the very legitimation of faith itself emerges as an issue, which is appropriately seen when the Paraclete speeches are placed in the larger context of the discourse. The anomos of persecution by the world leads to the question of theodicy and the very foundation of faith itself.[72]

---

[71] See Dodd's conclusions along this same line of thought in Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge: The University Press, 1963, pp. 347, 423ff. S. Schulz argues persuasively that the johannine expressions came from a diverse background. He contends that the traditions reaching fruition in the Gospel of John came from 1) the late Jewish apocalypticists, 2) the Essenes of Qumran and Damascus, 3) the Mandean exponents, and 4) the baptist sect of John. All of these groups were at home in Palestine and all contributed as bearers of tradition which reached the johannine community (habura). These oral traditions existed, according to Schulz, from the beginning of Christianity along with the synoptic traditions and were finally put into gospel form and transmitted by John (cf. Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1960, esp. pp. 150f and 183-186).

---

[72] This language has been adapted from the facinating book by Peter Berger, The Sacred Canopy, Elements of a Sociological Theory of Religion, Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1967. To quote Berger in his chapter on "The Problem of Theodicy:"

> Every nomos is established, over and over again, against the threat of its destruction by the anomic forces endemic to the human condition. In religious terms, the sacred order of the cosmos is reaffirmed, over and over again, in the face of chaos. . . . A problem is also posed on the level of legitimation. The anomic phenomena must not only be lived through, they must also be explained--to wit, explained in terms of the nomos established in the society in question. An explanation of these phenomena in terms of religious legitimations, of whatever degree of theoretical sophistication, may be called a theodicy. (p. 53)

The response of John to the situation of the community is investigated in Chapter 3. John exhorts the community to an ethic which demonstrably battles the evil powers of the cosmos as well as verifies the community's faith. Such ethical suggestions can be shown through a careful exegesis of certain themes common to the farewell discourse. Those themes point to an ethic bound to the community's response to its covenant with their Lord.

In Chapter 4 an analysis of materials written with reference to similar persecution situations places John within a larger tradition of persecution literature and the ethical responses of such literature help to put John's exhortations in broader perspective.

CHAPTER II

THE SITUATION OF THE JOHANNINE COMMUNITY

A. The Farewell Discourse as Bridge to the Situation

The situation of the church community to whom John addresses his gospel can best be unraveled from chapters 13-17.[1] This judgment is based primarily upon the literary form of these chapters: a farewell discourse. This literary form exposes the significance of these adeptly conceived and executed chapters.

A farewell discourse has been described succinctly as a form having to do ". . . nearly always with the last speech of a dying man: supreme recommendations, very often accompanied by predictions" were given, for "belief in a mysterious clairvoyance in those who were about to die was strongly anchored in the spirit of the ancients."[2] Such a form is found throughout Near Eastern culture, among the classic literatures of Greece and Rome as well as with the Hebrews, even though there are slight variations between the pattern as employed by the Greeks and that used by the Hebrews.[3] The features common to the Old Testament usage include:

---

[1] Such a starting point has been suggested as well by Ernst Käsemann in *Jesu letzter Wille*. Günther Bornkamm generally concurs with this point of departure because the farewell discourse does represent a significant place in the total gospel ("Zur Interpretation des Johannesevangeliums." *EvTh* 28 (1968), especially pp. 16ff). Louis Martyn appears to discredit such an emphasis, however, because, he contends, the discourse tends to lure one into reading the gospel as a "spiritual Gospel" and then one does not have to bother "one whit" about the historical setting and circumstances of the gospel (*History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, New York: Harper and Row, p. xvi). The discussion to follow shows that just the opposite conclusion to that of Martyn's must be drawn from the farewell discourse.

---

[2] As summarized by Jacques Dupont, *Le Discours de Milet: Testament Pastorale de Saint Paul* (Acts 20, 18-36), Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1962, pp. 11-12. For other general discussions of the farewell discourse as a literary form see also, O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*, translated by P. R. Ackroyd, New York: Harper and Row, pp. 12-13; E. Stauffer, "Abschiedsreden," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Vol. 1, ed. by Theoder Klauser, Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag-G.M.B.H., 1950, Cols. 29-35; Johannes Munck, "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la litterature biblique," in the Festschrift for M. Goguel, *Au Sources de la tradition chrétienne*, Paris: Neuchatel, 1950, pp. 155-170.

[3] In the concise but excellent article by E. Stauffer, "Abschiedsreden," the distinctions between the Greek and Hebrew forms include two differences: 1. In the Greek usages the one who is dying is viewed as a ϑεῖος ἄνϑρωπος (whether this would reflect accurately his example of Socrates is a live question), whereas the Old Testament's model is that of an ἄνϑρωπος ϑεοῦ , a bearer of an office and a middleman between God and man. 2. The Greek form often includes political and philosophical testaments of the dying man which have no real parallel in the exhortatory teachings of the Hebrew model. Karl Holl suggests that the Greek form is employed primarily to present an ideal by personifying it, whereas the biblical form works always to present the place of individuals within the community and the coherence between these personalities and the covenant of the Salvation-History. Such a conclusion does seem to be a better statement than is Stauffer's at this point, e.g., the use of Socrates' farewell fits Holl's interpretation more adequately than that of Stauffer's ϑεῖος ἄνϑρωπος generality. Holl's summary is closer to that which is followed in this monograph also. (K. Holl "Die schriftstellerische Form des griechischen Heiligenlebens," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. 2, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck, 1928.)

(1) a person of stature speaks at his death (e.g., Moses, Jacob, Samuel), (2) predictions are made concerning his death, (3) instructions and regulations are given for his followers, (4) words of departure, consolation, and of promise are given to the inner circle of associates, (5) threats of accountability are given to those who fail to follow through on the words spoken by the dying man, and (6) concluding prayers are offered for those who are left behind and a blessing is spoken over them. Following the words of the farewell an account of the death is given.[4]

These characteristics indicate that this literary form serves to exhort the assembled community. The departing leader assures the continuity of the community by his summary of past events and his emphasis on exhortations and predictions for the future. Such a speech centers most often on his own life as a model. It is significant that this literary form was used extensively during the intertestamental period when, it would appear, the times demanded the exhortatory possibilities which the farewell discourse form could provide (cf. Tobit 13, 14:3-11; I Maccabees 2:49-68; II Maccabees 7; 4 Esra 14:18-50; Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch 77).

---

[4] Characteristics which do not appear as often, but which contain great significance for the form as it is worked out in John, include also the dying man retelling his life and its place in the Salvation-History of the sacred people and, in turn, to this story is tied the moral exhortations which have their referent in the model of the saintly life related. In addition, there appears often prophecy concerning the future of the people at the eschaton in which an apocalyptic tableau is presented. These items are discussed by J. Munck in "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament," p. 159.

Old Testament examples of this form include: Joshua 23-24:32; Genesis 47:29-50:14; I Samuel 12; I Kings 2:1-9; and Deuteronomy as a whole. Among a host of others, I Timothy 4:1ff; 2 Timothy 3:1ff, and Acts 20:17-31 may be mentioned as New Testament examples.

But to what extent do chapters 13-17 of John fit the pattern of the farewell discourse? Even keeping in mind the warning of Amos Wilder that such a procedure as calling John 13-17 a farewell discourse is bound to mislead,[5] it is clear that these chapters are best comprehended when analyzed in relation to the general, complex pattern of that literary form as presented above. In a simply constructed comparison with a notable farewell discourse from the Old Testament, Joshua 23-24:32, the similar features are strikingly evident.[6]

1) A person of stature speaks at his death:

Joshua 23:2	John 13:2

2) Predictions are made concerning his death:

Joshua 23:14	John 13:21ff.

---

[5] See Amos Wilder, The Language of the Gospel; Early Christian Rhetoric, New York: Harper and Row, 1964, p. 43, where he warns against applying any interpretation to a rigid evaluation of literary form.

[6] These are arranged according to the points of Dupont and the texts do not reveal the sequential correspondence noted here. Other good examples for comparison in this regard include Deuteronomy, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; the Book of Enoch 91:3-19. The discourse of Paul at Miletus in Acts 20:17-38 is also instructive, and it exhibits the ingredients: 1) assembles people, 2) exhorts them, 3) gives self as model for imitation, 4) gives prediction of persecutions which are coming--they will suffer and false teachers will threaten them, 5) pronounces benediction, 6) gives final prayer.

3) Instructions and regulations are given for the followers:
   Joshua 23:6; 24:14ff.   John 14-15:17
4) Words of departure, consolation, and promise are given to the inner circle of associates:
   Joshua 24:14ff.   John 16:4b-33
5) A threat of accountability to those who fail to follow through:
   Joshua 23:15ff; 24:20; 24:27   John--absent, except as implied in the speech of 15:18ff and 16:1[7]
6) Concluding prayer for those left behind and a blessing over them:
   Joshua 24:25, if at all   John Chapter 17.

Certainly the common features of these two pieces can readily point to a common literary form, even though the ingredients of the form may float from place to place within the body of the discourse.[8]

The johannine farewell discourse[9] has no parallel in the synoptic gospels, where the passion account itself forms the center of attention rather than any farewell address of Jesus, and the words of Jesus are interspersed in the framework of the tale in a manner similar to the other parts of those gospels.[10] In John 13-17 the focus is on the lengthy monologue of Jesus, with a few conversations with disciples added; and the passion account is then related much after the pattern of the synoptic gospels. Chapters 13-17 in John are written as a farewell discourse because of John's basic intention of establishing the community in understanding and motivation through the means of example and exhortation. Such intentions were at the heart of this literary form.

---

[7] The "woes" to those who do not follow through are not found in John explicitly. This does set the johannine form off from many other farewell discourses. However, the speeches of 15:18ff and 16:1 do implicitly contain caution words which would have little meaning if the threat of apostasy was not present.

[8] Joshua 23-24 appears to be, from the form critical view-point, a composite rather than a smoothly conceived discourse, thus suggesting different sources. Yet the discourse as a whole puts forth a picture which can be seen as a unity by the reader (see, e.g., Edward Nielsen, Shechem, Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad, 1955, pp. 86-141 where the possible sources of these chapters are examined). This is similar to the johannine discourse in that John 13-17 is certainly made up of a number of individual sayings and pericopae. See the excellent study of Bent Noack, Zur johanneischen Tradition, Kopenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1954.

[9] Throughout this chapter the singular (farewell discourse) is used, and not the plural, since chapters 13-17 do suppose one discourse (in spite of the abrupt ending of chapter 14) and ought to be considered throughout as such a unified literary form.

The significance of the farewell discourse for John is evidenced first by the very utilization of the form itself. But of further interest is the length which is given for the final discourse within the gospel as a whole. As a literary unit, a farewell discourse could be either short or long (e.g., Tobit 14:3-11, where nine verses form the farewell, and Deuteronomy, where the entire book is conceived as a farewell address by Moses);[11] however, the form is employed, almost without exception, in a succinct way. Since John's discourse comprises four chapters at the minimum, and its associated context includes as many as ten chapters, it is apparent that it holds a, if not the, most significant place in the gospel.[12] Wilder has observed that early Christian speech-forms were quite brief in comparison with those of the surrounding cultures and, therefore: "We must believe that the length of any early Christian text was fundamentally determined by what the message called for in the given situation or the needs of instruction or exhortation."[13]

---

[10] There is no parallel account of a farewell discourse in the synoptics, even though there is an extended address of Jesus in Mark 13. But there the emphasis is almost exclusively on the apocalyptic end time. There is no attempt at constructing a discourse form such as has been outlined by Stauffer, with inclusions of regulations and instructions, words of departure, concluding prayer for those left behind, etc.

[11] T. Glasson discusses the relationship of Deuteronomy and John as farewell discourses in his book Moses in the

Since the discourse is pivotal in the gospel, there is justification in making it the point of departure and locus of interest as well. Because the farewell form was utilized as a prime means for expressing exhortatory instruction and encouragement of ethical action, it is fair to start with the supposition that John has employed such a form for that purpose as well. Form and content are bound

---

Fourth Gospel, Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, 1963, especially pp. 74ff.

[12] In contrast to Bornkamm's attack upon Käsemann's analysis of the discourse as the point of highest importance. Bornkamm maintains that one cannot justly interpret the entire gospel from these chapters ("Zur Interpretation des Johannesevangelium," p. 16).

[13] Wilder, The Language of the Gospel, p. 29. Note his well conceived discussion in the first chapter of that book. Also quite helpful is his final chapter where he includes the observation: "In each . . . new cultural setting the primal dynamic reshaped the particular language-world and language-vehicles (italics added) to its own purposes and in its own defense." (129)

inextricably together.[14] Therefore, because of the literary form employed in chapters 13-17 one would expect to find these chapters of high value in helping to determine: 1) what kind of church John was intimate with and writing to, and 2) what the situation of that group was.

Because John lacks ecclesiological terms in the traditional sense there has been considerable debate as to whether or not John was concerned at all with what could be called a "church," with offices and confession. Nevertheless, it is now a scholarly consensus[15] that there is no lack of ecclesiology in the Gospel of John.[16] Even so, there is still considerable discussion as to where the johannine view of the church is best ferreted out. Because the literary form of farewell discourse is intimately tied to a gathered community and to instruction of that community, the meaning of the johannine church community can, in all likelihood, be reconstructed from John's lengthy farewell discourse. This is not to conclude that the rest of the gospel is unimportant in this connection, but scholars who contend that chapters 13-17 are the appropriate setting of churchly understanding in John have their arguments bolstered by the form and content associated with the farewell discourse as a literary piece.

---

[14] This is merely to state bluntly what has been demonstrated skillfully by Robert Funk in his work on the importance of form and structure. See especially: Language, Hermenentic, and Word of God, New York: Harper and Row, 1966, pp. 124ff--especially p. 127.

[15] For example, Alf Corell, Consummatum Est. Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John, translated by the Order of the Paraclete, Whitby, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958; E. Käsemann, Jesu letzter Wille; E. Schweizer, "Der Kirchen begriff im Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes," Neotestamentica; N. Lazure, Les valeurs morales de la theologie johannique; O. Michael, "Das Gebet des scheidenden Erlösers," ZST 18 (1941) 521-534, among a host of others.

[16] Whether this church is viewed as a sacramental community (Cullmann), or as an enthusiastic-docetic group (Käsemann and Schweizer), or as simply a Gemeinde (Faulhaber, Bultmann).

It is, of course, incumbent upon the person who argues his case built upon the centrality of the farewell discourse to account, ultimately, for the first eleven or twelve chapters of the Gospel of John. However, it is not unjust to concentrate upon the farewell discourse in John with the intention of later attempting to reconcile such a study with the first half of the gospel. Dodd's observation that the tendency of the farewell discourse is to specify sayings which, in the earlier part of the gospel, have a general or indefinite reference[17] could be reversed by such a study and the specificity of the farewell discourse could be utilized in giving substance to the earlier part of the work. But, it is sufficient to say at this point that the first part of the gospel is interested in relating the history of the savior as he acted among men; this motif, in turn, sets the context for the poignant consummation of ethical and exhortatory comment in the farewell address. It could be argued, in fact, that such an historical recapitulation of Jesus' life was a part of the literary form itself, though such reconstructions were usually retold by the dying one himself. The arguments of this paper do not, however, rest upon that conjecture.

---

[17] These sayings are applied directly to the disciples (e.g., 15:23). This points to a basic intention of the evangelist to speak to the community specifically and not to write a mere general treatise.

B. The Communal Situation: The Crisis of Persecution

The judgment that the farewell discourse is the climax of the johannine account involves a judgment as well about the purpose of the gospel. Based upon the presuppositions of form and content as discussed above, the focus of John's gospel is primarily exhortation to that community which followed Jesus.[18] This supposition can be tested by

---

[18] For a discussion of the possibilities open to one who seeks to know why John was written, see the summary in R. Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xii), Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1966, pp. lxvii-lxxix, where he discusses briefly the possibilities advanced by scholars which include: 1. as an apologetic against the sectarians of John the Baptist; 2. as a polemic against the Jews; 3. as a writing against Christian heretics (e.g., gnostics or docetists); 4. as an encouragement to believing Christians of both Gentile and Jewish origin.

It is interesting that van Unnik, a proponent of the missionary purpose of John admits that chapters 13-17 were apparently written for Christians and "show a somewhat different character" from the rest of the gospel ("The Purpose of John's Gospel," The Gospels Reconsidered: The Four Gospels in 1957, Oxford: Blackwell, 1960, p. 195). Van Unnik's suggested purpose for the gospel is certainly called into question by such an admission.

One of the most innovative suggestions is certainly that of Colwell, "The Fourth Gospel and the Struggle for Respectability," JR 14 (1934), where he argues that the gospel was really written to assure Christianity's social place in its Asia Minor context, and hence to make Christianity reconstructing the situation of the local community as it is revealed by the gospel writer, whether implicity or explicitly, in the farewell discourse.

Textual Analysis

The pericope which offers the most explicit clues for the communal situation in the farewell discourse is 15:18 through 16:4a. These verses, set off by Bultmann with the title "The Hatred of the World," portray the disciples who follow Jesus as the direct recipients of persecution at the hand of the world. Here Jesus issues the warning that those believers who continue to follow him will receive a sad reception by the world and by the ruler of the world: Satan (16:4a). Such a general mood of pessimism and distress exhibited in this section is specified in 16:2 where the prediction is rendered that πᾶς ὁ ἀποϰτείνας ὑμᾶς δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ ϑεῷ . In the succinct verses of 16:1-4a, the occasion for the writing of the gospel comes forcefully to the fore.

---

respectable. John accomplished this by omitting or transforming most of the ugly features in the career of Jesus: Jesus is less of a magician than in the synoptics; Jesus is separated from the Jews in an attempt to give respectability to Christians apart from the despised Jews; the eucharist of eating and drinking the blood of Jesus is replaced by the innocuous theme of feet-washing, etc. Such an analysis, however, distorts the importance of exhortation in the farewell discourse and dispels the urgency which is at the heart of those chapters. When these chapters constituting the farewell discourse are carefully considered they bring to the surface the non-respectability of the followers of Jesus and their struggle to survive in spite of that fact.

In reconstructing the situation of the community, 16:1-4a should be carefully observed, then the larger context of 15:18-16:4a may be noted. Such an analysis then allows the entire spectrum and intention of the farewell discourse to reveal itself more concretely. This is the procedure which will be followed below.

John 16:1-4a.--16:1-4a is a tightly structured conclusion to the whole section comprised of 15:18-16:4a which deals with the hatred of the disciples by the world. Verses 16:1 and 16:4a are parallel statements giving the reason for the warnings. The ταῦτα λελάληκα of v. 1 and its call for steadfastness is brought to bear again in 16:4a where the ταῦτα λελάληκα and the accompanying ἵνα clause of v. 4a give yet a more detailed account as to why Jesus has told his disciples about ταῦτα : when the disciples remember that Jesus has predicted the persecutions which do, in fact, begin to occur, they will then have confidence that 1) such events were not unexpected and 2) by being prepared for the worst they will be more firm in holding to their faith. Thus, 16:1-4a boldly concludes the pericope by easing the burden of the disciples with words of consolation from the lord.[19]

The first specific threat which is mentioned concerning the impending persecution is that of expulsion from the synagogue. Given the use of ἀποσυνάγωγος (16:2; 9:22; 12:42), it appears clear that the prediction is not the simple synagogue excommunication or ban. The ordinary ban (nidduy) was of a short duration of thirty days, with accompanying equal periods of time added to the original amount of time if the intended repentance and reform were not achieved. Such expulsion made provision for the man and his family to worship and bring his offering. He was cut off from his comrades for the duration, such as at the sharing of meals, but he was not excommunicated from the religious community in any final sense. On the other hand, the severity of the exclusion described by John shows that he did not have such a punishment as the synagogue ban in mind.[20]

---

[19] Bultmann likewise views 16:1-4a as a unit and points out that the negative μὴ σκανδαλισθῆτε of v. 1 is countered by the positive ἵνα...μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν of v. 4a, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 429.

In John, the ἀποσυνάγωγος refers, without doubt, to a permanent form of expulsion. Therefore, one must look for a setting in which such a ban could have been enacted and enforced. Such a course of action can be attached readily to the actions of the council at Jamnia, where reference is made to such a permanent expulsion; and, interestingly enough, that expulsion is directed to Christians and heretics. The Eighteen Benedictions comprised the formal prayer repeated by the Jewish worshippers in the synagogue. The discussion here centers on the twelfth benediction which was altered, most likely by Samuel the Small, in the time of Rabban Gamaliel II during the period of 80-90 A.D.[21] The twelfth benediction had read: "For persecutors let there be no hope, and the dominion of arrogance do Thou speedily root out in our days." But to those words were added: "And let Christians (Nazorites) and minim (הנוצרים והמינים) perish in a moment, let them be blotted out of the book of the living and let them not be written with the righteous."[22] The addition suggests that the Christian movement was considered a threat by this time and the liturgy itself had to be altered to take those worshippers, who thought that the Messiah had come, into account as members of an apostate sect. Even though the exact date of this alteration cannot be determined precisely, it was likely introduced at Jamnia during the decade mentioned above.[23]

---

[20] A discussion of the synagogue ban can be found in Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Vol. 4, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlags, 1928, pp. 293-333, and especially pp. 304, 329-331. Three other fine discussions can be found in Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, pp. 299-300; Louis Martyn, History and Theology, pp. 17-41, which is the only discussion attempting to see in the synagogue ban an essential part of the problem facing the johannine community; and D. Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to Matthew, Cambridge: The University Press, 1967, pp. 54-55.

All three johannine passages in which ἀποσυνάγωγος is mentioned (9:22; 12:42; 16:2) fall into the same pattern of a more serious threat than that of the mere ban (nidduy). The term itself is found in the New Testament only in John.

---

[21] The Eighteen Benedictions and the new additions made to the twelfth benediction as being aimed at Christians are discussed in W. D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1964, pp. 275-276; Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 300; Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommantar*, Vol. 4, p. 331; and, once again, a lengthy consideration of this problem is given by Martyn, *History and Theology*, pp. 31-40 where something is at stake for his whole understanding of John.

Carroll's view that the twelfth benediction was altered around A.D. 90 by Shemuel ha-Quaton is another possibility, but likely too late (K. L. Carroll, "The Fourth Gospel and the Exclusion of Christians from the Synagogues," *BJRL* (1957-58), p. 22.

Davies and Hunzinger (whose views in *Die jüdische Bannpraxis im neutestamentlicher Zeitalter* are reviewed in *ThL* 80 (1955) cols. 114f) are correct in pointing out that Strack-Billerbeck is one sided in the presentation of the ban in the Judaism of the New Testament period and lacks any notice at all of the outright expulsion possibilities.

By having the twelfth benediction of the Tefillah in mind, the meaning of the verse (16:2) can be more intelligible. The two predictions of foreboding times center on the expulsion from the synagogue and the death of the disciples who would be killed by men acting under the aegis of the religious duties of their faith: πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς δόξῃ λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ . It is intriguing that these two threats, which are set side by side, parallel the exhortation (i.e., commandment, or prayer of faith) offered by the twelfth benediction: the Christians (Nazorites), and heretics, are not to be written with the righteous, i.e., they are to be excluded from God's holy people; and the plea is that they "perish in a moment," and "be blotted out of the book of the living," i.e., "let them be killed!"[24] It appears, then, that the gospel alludes here, even in structure, to the ban in the benedictions.

---

[22] Davies, Ibid., p. 275. [23] Ibid., p. 276.

[24] Such a contention accords with a Midrash to Numbers 25:13 which ways: "Every man who pours out the blood of the godless is as one who offers a sacrifice." Quoted in E. C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, p. 483.

The Eighteen Benedictions comprised the synagogue benedictions which only the true Jewish believer would be able to lead. Obviously, there is an implied continuity between the recited prayer of faith in the synagogue service (λατρεία--the word occuring in John 16:2) of worship and the way one went about his daily life in service (λατρεία) to God. If the Jew of this period took seriously the living of his faith, then the emended twelfth benediction could be taken as a mandate to serve God by the physical persecution of the godless and idolaters, among whom would be counted the Christians. It is not unwarranted to suggest that what John had in mind in 16:2 is a reaction to the change in the synagogue benedictions and the accompanying change to active hostility during or after the time of Gamaliel II. Such a conclusion provides a terminus a quo from which to locate the time and situation addressed by the evangelist.

A perplexing problem is still left unresolved if the context suggested here is correct, and that is: if the Jews did persecute, and even murder, the Christians around the years A.D. 80-100, by what authority were they able to accomplish this? Would this not presuppose a consent from the imperial government, regardless of where such Jews might be living? Martyn poses this question, and concludes that such action assumes that the Jewish leaders had de facto power within their own section of the city.[25] This assumption limits the number of possible locales where such Jewish communities would be that strong. Martyn uses this limitation to suggest Alexandria as the most valid place to look for such a community and situation of power. Goppelt, on the other hand, argues that persecutions of Christians by Jews were common in the Roman Empire from Paul's time to the end of the third century.[26] He recalls Tertullian's statement which called the synagogue the Brutstätten der Verfolgung.[27] Further, Goppelt contends that Asia Minor is the most likely spot for such action by Jews because sectarian persecutions were particularly frequent in that region.[28] There, Goppelt states, "the synagogue believed they must persecute the Christians until they were extinguished (bis zum Vernichtung).[29] Unfortunately, for these suggestions, Goppelt does not provide any concrete evidence to sustain his generalizing tenets, and that weakens his case greatly.

As far as substantial evidence one way or another is concerned, the problem remains enigmatic. However, the many references to such persecutions in early Christian literature would strongly suggest that such events did occur and were not just a part of the Christian's vivid imagination. Actually, a systematic persecution on the part of the Jewish community does not need to be posited. In fact, a small band of men could be responsible for large disruption within the Christian community. The legality of such action under Roman law might not be an issue at all.[30]

---

[25] Martyn, History and Theology, p. 57, n. 93.

[26] L. Goppelt, Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert, Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1954, p. 246.

[27] Ibid., p. 247.

[28] Ibid.

[29] Ibid., p. 254.

Hare concludes that the persecution of Christians by the Jews in the post-war period did not cease until the mission to Israel waned with the withdrawal of the Christians from the synagogues. The change in the Eighteen Benedictions shows that this removal was still going on in the latter half of the first century.[31] In the post-war years, the maltreatment of Christians occurred primarily in the Diaspora as the synagogues attempted to silence the new doctrines, concerning the Messiah, in their midst.[32] As the beatings and persecutions continued, instigated by the leaders of the synagogues, the fourth evangelist--as an obvious leader within his community--likely reacted to the situation by seeing it as the fulfillment of the omnious predictions of the end times carried in the common Christian tradition (e.g., as is evidenced in Mt. 24f; Mk. 13, etc.). This appears to be the context out of which John makes his response. The sectarian traditions utilized by John, filled as they were with the themes of persecution of the righteous, would fit well into such a view of the situation.[33]

---

[30] Douglas Hare argues that there is not a single clear case of judicial execution of a Christian by a Jewish religious authority for purely religious purposes, as would be the case here. It is possible that the Sanhedrin had the power to try capital cases, but still no reference to such a trial appears (Jewish Persecution, pp. 21-22). He concludes that any killing and extensive physical persecution up to the War with Rome and the period between that date and Bar Cocheba was carried out by mob action (Jewish Persecution, p. 35).

Hare's conclusion is worthy of note, too, when he says, with regard to John 16:2: "It is not unusual for a persecuted group to anticipate worse treatment than it actually receives. The likelihood of such an anticipation is heightened by the treasuring of an apocalyptic tradition concerning the woes of the 'last days'" (p. 42). Such a conclusion, of course, still realizes the seriousness of the fear and apprehension of the community anticipating such recourse.

[31] Ibid., p. 127.

That the evangelist responded to such a situation believing that the ominous warnings were now in the process of actualization can be adduced further by a comparison of the difference between John 16:2 and the possible synoptic parallels. Lagrange, for example, thinks that John 16:2 is parallel to the apocalyptic warnings of persecution found in Mark 13:13; Matthew 24:9; and Luke 21:17, among other places.[34]

---

[32] Ibid., pp. 168-169. Hare's restriction of such maltreatment to the Christian missionaries and not to the general body of Christians is too restrictive, in principle. Synagogues were threatened not only by open preaching of missionaries but also by ordinary Christians in their midst. The conclusion is not without merit that precisely because missionaries are singled out in the sources as the bearers of persecution so also were all Christians attacked. If this were not the case why did Christians leave the synagogues en masse? Can it be supposed that any Christians would not be considered apostates from the Jewish faith and therefore suspect?

[33] Cf. chapter one,p. 39, n. 71.

[34] Lagrange, Évangile selon Saint Jean, Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1927, p. 409.

It is significant to note, however, that the synoptic redactions place these predictions of the end time in the context of a missionary purpose: when the gospel has been preached to all, then the end time will come (Mt. 24:14).

Mark 13:9-10 states: "But take heed for yourselves; for they will deliver you up to councils; and you will be beaten in synagogues; and you will stand before governors and kings for my sake, to bear testimony before them. And the gospel must first be preached to all nations." The more general apocalyptic prophecy of impending persecution seems intended here because both the religious leaders of the Jews and the imperial magistrates are included in the all-sweeping threat.[35] Certainly just as important a component in this consideration is the fact that in Mark verses are directed at and for the general missionary task of discipleship which rests firmly in the "day of Yahweh" when all the world will have received the gospel ("And the gospel must _first_ be preached to all nations."). John does not provide such an overarching view of things; on the contrary, the threats appear much more immediate, especially in the context of the pericope 15:18-16:4a, and this suggests a tie with a specific persecution period.[36]

---

[35] A consideration noted also by C. H. Dodd, _The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel_, p. 391, n. 1. This is to leave unsettled the question whether or not the _sachlich_ intention and purpose of the warning of persecutions in Mark 13, for example, is identical to that of the Fourth Gospel. Mark says: "He who endures to the end will be saved." If steadfastness is the goal of the warnings in Mark, then John and Mark might be similarly intended, for such is John's purpose, as will be shown below.

However, even if the passage is different from the synoptic warnings of persecutions, the question remains whether or not the johannine setting is in fact tied to a specific series of events, or whether it is merely giving "dictums" as to what a Christian life in general will be like. Loisy concludes that the latter alternative is the more likely and argues that 16:2 is quite general in content and the evangelist has utilized it because of his overall preoccupation with the Jews. He contends, therefore, that it is merely a theological argument without historical specificity.[37] Bultmann, on the other hand, recognizes the historical significance of 16:2 for the setting of the johannine account. He writes:

> The historical point of time is clarified primarily through the ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς (v.2). It

---

[36] The later problem of worshipping the emperor does not seem to be a concern here. One could conceivably argue that the johannine passage is subtlely referring to the persecutions carried out by the emperors, acting as gods, and the emperor's people who actually carried through the persecutions as those who were doing λατρεία to the emperor. It might be too easy to tie the situation to one between only the Christians and Jews. However, since there is no evidence to suggest that John is waging such a subtle attack against the governmental authorities (in a fashion similar to the Apocalypse of John) the argument advanced in this monograph views the situation as one involving Christians and Jews.

The farewell discourse is unlike the synoptic passion accounts also in the fact of including forecasts of the future destiny of Jesus' followers (16:26; 14:20; 14:3). "All this is alien to the synoptic outlook." (C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 408.)

[37] Loisy, *Le quatrième Évangile*, Paris: Emile Nourry, 1921, p. 428.

> is the time in which the Christian community has decided to sever itself from the synagogue, and, thereby, to lose the protection of a religio licita. It is the time which rules approximately from Paul to Justin, so that a more exact determination of the time cannot be expected.[38]

In an accompanying note, Bultmann rightly emphasizes that the relation of the various Christian communities to the exclusion from the synagogue, and hence their relations with the Jews, varied immensely from place to place; therefore, no single time and place can be inferred from the information.[39] Yet, if this passage could be related directly to the results of the Jamnia council, as has been suggested above, then even Bultmann's time span could be shortened (from the time of Paul up to 80-90 A.D.). Bultmann's conclusion, that the evangelist is thinking ". . . doch wohl of such a systematic struggle against the Christians, not of a single event in which the Jews by their own power kill Christians,"[40] implies that the situation conveyed by John points to a place where Christian communities were faced with much stronger, both numerically and politically, Jewish communities. Such a conclusion fits well with the surroundings already mentioned above.

The entire conclusion of this broader pericope (16:1-4a) lends further support to the intensive mood of the persecution situation described in 16:2. The foreboding sound is given in 16:1 where the reason for writing concerning these affairs is provided by the author: ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλισθῆτε.

---

[38] Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 428 (see also note 4). Martyn finds no problem either with seeing here evidence for a specific historical occurrence, History and Theology, pp. 47-48.

[39] Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 428.

[40] Ibid.

Σκανδαλίζειν in 16:1 refers to the threat of apostasy in the face of persecution. The verse may be construed, therefore, as an appeal for steadfastness in a time of despair. Σκανδαλίζειν is frequently employed in a similar fashion. The synoptics often use the term to warn of apostasy in persecution contexts. Matthew 24:10 (also 26:31; 26:33), a verse which is connected with the apocalyptic period of impending woes, relates that when persecution comes many will σκανδαλισθήσονται. Mark likewise uses the term when he talks of coming persecutions (e.g., Mark 14:27, 29).[41] Hence, by using σκανδαλίζειν in this connection, John shows that the problem to which he addresses himself is one of steadfastness in faithfulness, and this is at issue because there is a threat to life itself at the hands of the zealous pursuers.

16:4a also contains an indicator that the persecution which is presented as a possible future event by Jesus is in fact a present reality for the community to whom John is speaking. This also provides supportive evidence that the johannine context is not mere apocalyptic soundings of the fateful days to come at the antitipated end time, even if such a thought is included in it. Such a clue to the contemporaneity of the persecutions--that the community being addressed is now facing disastrous times--is found in John's use of μνημονεύειν , and the companion terms ofμιμνήσκεσθαι, and ὑπομιμνῄσκειν . Each of these terms is used with a similarly broad meaning by the evangelist. These words which have to do with "recalling" are generally, if not always, used by John to demonstrate that the proper understanding and comprehension of Jesus' word was present only after the glorification in his resurrection and, therefore, are to be associated with the johannine community and not with the disciples of the earthly Jesus.

---

[41] σκανδαλίζειν is also used by the evangelists to refer to one causing to sin, or one being caused to sin (e.g., Mark 9:42,43,45,47; Matthew 5:29,30; Luke 17:2), and it is also employed to denote a feeling of repulsion, which certainly comes closer to apostasy but is not identical to it (e.g., Luke 7:23:23). Stählin argues that in the last speeches of Jesus before his death in both the synoptics as well as John the word is used to exhort the disciples to stand fast in the face of apostasy (e.g., Mt. 24:25; Lk. 22:31). Cf. G. Stählin, "σκάνδαλον, σκανδαλίζω," TWNT, Vol. 7, p. 358.

Characteristic of this feature is John 2:22 which reports: "Therefore when he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered (ἐμνήσθησαν) that he said this, and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus spoke." At the entry into Jerusalem in 12:16 it is reported: "His disciples did not understand this at first, but when Jesus was glorified (i.e., resurrected), then they remembered (ἐμνήσθησαν) that this had been written of him and had been done to him." 2:17 makes reference also to the disciples remembering an appropriate scripture, also with the verb μιμνήσκεσθαι . All three references deal directly with the remembering of holy scripture. However, the first two examples show clearly that the reference is _ex eventu_ simply because Jesus has departed and is glorified before understanding can be read back into the actions related.

In the farewell discourse itself there is a continual reminder that only those who are living in the time of the glorification, following the death[42] of Jesus, are the ones who properly understand his earthly life. By such construction the evangelist placed into the mouth of Jesus references to the events which were already in the process of happening to and in the community.[43] Jesus washes the feet of the disciples, but they do not understand what he is doing to them. Since the evangelist's concern is with the community which is living after the departure of Jesus, and which is guided by the Spirit, he makes here a reference to the misunderstanding of the disciples of Jesus and has inserted the statement: "What I am doing to you you do not know (οἶδας) now but after these things (a reference to the death of Jesus) you will know (John 13:7)." In like manner 13:19 includes use of the future prediction for this purpose: "I say this to you now, before it happens, that you might believe that I am he (a reference to Jesus' foreknowledge of his true disciples and of the one who was to betray him)." Under the guidance of the Spirit the community now has understanding, where previously there had been none. Thus, the point is stressed continuously that even though Jesus told of the portentous times ahead and of all things necessary for life, such teachings were misunderstood by his contemporaries, both Jew (especially chapters 1-12) and disciple (especially chapters 13-17). This feature is summarized well in 14:26: "But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name, that one will teach you in all things and bring to your remembrance (ὑπομνήσει) everything which I said to you."[44]

---

[42] See the connection of these terms as they are developed by Bultmann, _Theology of the New Testament_, Vol. 2, pp. 56-57, and _Johannes-Evangelium_, p. 327ff.

[43] Martyn has pointed to this same phenomenon and has called this feature of johannine writing a two level drama. In dealing with chapter 9, Martyn attempts to demonstrate that even though Jesus is pictured as the one healing the blind man and then being confronted by the Jews for the deed, the real actor is the Christian preacher who has healed and who is being persecuted by the Jewish authorities of the city (_History and Theology_, pp. 10ff). Martyn has, unfortunately, chosen a less than advantageous point of departure in chapter 9, which, with the other miracle stories of the first twelve chapters, is most likely a traditional story about Jesus and not concerned with a "Christian preacher" at all. Yet, Martyn is correct in pointing to a two level drama in John and this most clearly comes to the fore in the farewell discourse.

Given the supposition that the community with which John is associated, and to which he writes, is the elect community under the guidance of the Spirit, it must be concluded that the words spoken by Jesus concerning life and future events are transmitted to the group through the Spirit. It would appear that, critically speaking, this is an attempt to ground the present situation of the community in the teaching of the earthly Jesus.[45]

---

[44] A more substantial treatment is given to the subject of the Paraclete below, p. 116ff.

If such is indeed the method employed by John in his reconstruction of the farewell discourse, one may conclude that John 16:4a and the surrounding context is concerned with the live issue of, and a continuing occurrence of, persecution carried on by the Jews. The intention of John is to provide comfort to the community in its time of trial, as well as to exhort its individuals to stand fast, just as the Lord had endured under similar circumstances. So, just as the time of writing is the time of understanding, i.e., the time of the glorification of Jesus and the accompanying teaching of the Spirit concerning all the things which Jesus said, so it is also the time of persecution during which time it is propitious to recall that Jesus had already exhorted his followers to stand fast during hard and evil times.

---

[45] Other passages where this phenomenon occurs include: 14:20, 29; 15:20; 16:21; and 16:4. Wrede points in the same direction, even if with this own particular slant, when he writes:

> Certainly the evangelist speaks, in the words which are formally directed to the disciples, as well to the Christians of his own time. One may believe that, for example, when Jesus prophesies concerning the hate of the world which will confront his own (15:18ff).

W. Wrede, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963, p. 189. Wrede does add that the gospel intends to convey the meaning that the disciples of Jesus will remember in their own time the things which Jesus said, and the reference does not need to be directed to a future community. (Ibid., p. 195).

Having analyzed the climax of the passage, now its relation to what precedes can be studied. The theme concerning the hatred of the world for the followers of Jesus is played out here in an interesting way. In 15:18 the subject of hatred is introduced by εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ . The εἰ used with the indicative connotes a reference to a present reality, and to indicate the meaning of this more precisely it might be better translated: "*since* the world hates you."[46] If the discussion on 16:1-4a adjudicated the evidence properly then this further evidence from syntactical usage should lend more support to the conclusion that John is speaking to the current situation in the farewell discourse. This helps to clarify, once again, the intention of John to deal with the problems of the present community, and *not* with the situation of Jesus' own life time. The world learns to hate the community only after Jesus is glorified, whereas it has hated Jesus during his own life time (15:18ff).

John 15:18-27.--15:18ff. advances the argument through yet another avenue. Following as it does upon the highly exhortatory section of 15:1-17, with its repeated emphasis that he who loves Jesus and seeks to follow him is he who heeds Jesus' commandments (15:4,5,10,12,17), this section shifts the scene to the hatred of the world toward Jesus and his disciples. As 15:1-17 stressed the disciple following his lord, so 15:18-21 continues this line of thought: because Jesus is hated, so will his disciples be hated. 15:18-21 concludes by saying that because the world does not know the origin of Jesus--and hence that of his disciples as well--they persecute both Jesus and the disciples. 15:22-25 demonstrates the world's ignorance and supports the contention by drawing on support from the tradition of scripture: "They hated me without a cause." 15:22-25 is used, to bolster the interpretation of 15:18-21. 15:18-21 begins with an εἰ clause and concludes with the reason for the hatred; so 15:22-25 begins with an εἰ clause and concludes with a scriptural reference to the ignorance of the hatred. The next two verses, 26-27, are imposed as a verification of the words which Jesus speaks and can, therefore, refer both to 15:18-25 and forward to 16:1-4a, the conclusion to the section.

---

[46] F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961, paragraphs 371, 372, pp. 188-89. The conditional sentence introduced by εἰ plus the indicative of all cases "denotes a simple conditional assumption with emphasis on the reality of the assumption: the condition is considered 'a real case.'" (εἰ with the indicative of reality, para. 373, p. 189). Barrett correctly conveys the proper meaning when he writes: εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ , as in fact it does." (*The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 399.).

In 15:18 the disciples are informed that if the world hates them, and it is implied that such is indeed the case, they should be aware that it hated Jesus first. In verse 20 they are reminded that the servant is not greater than his lord.[47] This immediately precedes the conditional sentence that if the world persecuted Jesus it will certainly persecute the disciples.[48] This movement from lower to higher (servant to master) which is common in John is carried to a more sublime analogue in verses 23 and 24. There Jesus says that the one who hates him (the Son) hates the Father, and v. 24 simply confirms that the world's own do hate both Jesus and the Father. By utilizing this analogy of the relationship between disciple-Jesus, and Jesus-Father, the evangelist works out his appeal for steadfastness. This suggests the model: "from unity of essence follows a common fate" (von Wesensverbundenheit folge Schicksalsgleichheit).[49] John asserts that nothing is expected of the disciple which has not already been exacted from Jesus himself. And, according to the argument developed by John within the context of a dualistic cosmos: Jesus-world, the hatred of the world is a

---

[47] This verse and context appear to be traditional

---

material which has come down through the early community generally. Matthew 10:24 also includes this wisdom piece that a servant is not above his master, and in a scene in which the disciples are forewarned of persecution ahead. Mt. 10 is also exhortation to the community. If there is a difference in emphasis the difference lies in John's shifting to an emphasis on the presentness of the woes: "the world *hates* you." (cf. Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, p. 408). John seems to be wanting to avoid the prophecy announced by Mt. 10:21 (which is not to say that he had Mt. before him; a looser transmission of tradition is contemplated here) for his appeal to steadfastness is meant to correct the betrayal of brother for brother which brings death. Steadfastness to the brother brings unity of will and victory.

[48] Bultmann sees correctly that the reference to διώκειν is a specification of the general μισεῖν and thus shows a movement from the very general (15:18) to the more specific (16:2), (*Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 423).

[49] *Ibid*., p. 422.

sign of the veracity of the disciples' steadfastness,[50] of the authenticity of their friendship to Jesus (15:14),[51] and evidence that they do not belong to the world.[52] This section speaks, then, 1) of a confirmation of the disciples in their relationship to Jesus, and 2) issues an exhortation for the disciples that they might remain firm and know what is expected of them.[53] The exhortatory mood pervades this whole pericope even if it becomes explicit only at 16:1.

The question can still be posed as to whether or not John has been faithful to his own apothegms. 15:20 repeats the saying of Jesus of 13:16: "a servant is not greater than his master," which is to summarize the dictum: because of the special relationship between master and slave the slave will bear the same fate as that of his master. However, in 15:15 Jesus makes a special point that his disciples are no longer to be considered his servants, but are now to be designated his "friends." From a form critical viewpoint, it seems most likely that the evangelist has selected pieces from at least two different strands of tradition at this point. This is certainly legitimate since the author is wanting to make two different points with these different apothegms. On the one hand he needs to employ the term "servant" in order to carry through his analogy between the fate of Jesus and the fate of the disciples. On the other hand, he must break with the servant analogy for the disciples (those in the johannine community) because the servant model implies that the servant does not know what his lord is about, whereas the disciples, guided by the Spirit, are acknowledged as those who know and understand the ways of their lord. A friend, because of his intimacy (the point of 15:1ff), understands what his friend is about. It is not a drastic judgment to suggest that the evangelist has chosen his models without systematic regard at this point, since they do conflict with one another; yet, the continuity of thought proceeds in spite of that. So, even though the disciples must share a common fate with their lord, they understand, as friends, what is happening to them and are, hopefully, willing to carry out the master's purpose.

---

[50] Loisy, Le quatrième Évangile, p. 422.

[51] Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, p. 479.

[52] Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 414.

[53] Bultmann is correct in his assumption that this section is in part a Mahnung (Johannes-Evangelium, p. 423).

The persecution motif of the adeptly conceived and executed section just canvassed is not isolated in the farewell discourse. The motif can be found scattered throughout the chapters of the last farewell and is certainly at the heart of the concern expressed in that discussion.

John 16:4b-33.--The remainder of chapter 16 provides further motifs bound to the persecution theme. 16:4b-15 picks up the subject of 15:26-27 concerning the Paraclete and carries this further. Jesus opens this new phase of the discourse by stating that the disciples grieve at what he has been saying, but none of them ask where he is going.[54] When the disciples recognize that the pain of departure is illusory since Jesus goes to the Father, the source of joy and life, then they will sense the meagerness of their pain as compared with the joy awaiting them. This retort reintroduces the benefits to be afforded by the Paraclete and his function in overcoming the burden of pain.[55] The emphasis is placed upon the benefit of Jesus' departure. 16:16-24 is also noteworthy in this respect. This pericope begins with a saying of Jesus to his disciples, a saying which he had spoken earlier in the gospel account: "A little while and you will see me no more; again a little while, and you will see me."[56] Researchers have advanced several interpretations of this passage. Dodd views the initial saying (which would properly include verses 16-20) as a reference to the death and resurrection of Jesus, and in no way a reference to apocalyptic. In this prediction of the last events of Jesus' death and the adjoining glorification, it is probable that the evangelist, Dodd asserts, by incorporating the parable on the pangs of childbirth, "intended also a wider application to Christians, who, like their Master, might be in danger through persecution."[57] However, the real intention of the passage remains concerned only with the death and resurrection of Jesus. Much earlier B. Weiss arrived at this same general conclusion and argued that the ὄψεσθέ με can be a reference only to the bodily *Wiedersehen* after the resurrection.[58] Barrett, on the other hand, begins with a much broader spectrum in observing this particular text. He admits that ὄψεσθέ με may refer to the bodily resurrection to take place "in two or three days;" however, he notes that the future here (ὄψεσθε) can have a referent of its own when, and if, it refers to the "apocalyptic vision of the glorious Son of Man (cf. Mk. 13:26; 14:62; 16:7; and John 1:50; 11:40)."[59] Thus, Barrett argues, "ὄψεσθε has an apocalyptic connotation but is not exclusively apocalyptic.... (John) retains the primitive Christian affirmation about the resurrection and the parousia, but fills in the period between them."[60] Accordingly, the pericope appears to be directed at the present situation of the readers, and is not a mere representation of the situation of the pre-Easter disciples. Dodd's analysis misses this important ingredient of John's discussion. Bultmann's interpretation of this section reflects strongly his overall theological understanding of the johannine gospel. For him, this section reflects the eternal, not just the immediate, concern of the community reading the gospel, i.e., not just the concern of the disciples of Jesus. Therefore, the ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς is not concerned with the parousia in the sense of the Jewish-primitive Christian apocalyptic; rather, the μίκρον points to the distance between the followers' hearing the word about Jesus and their response to it. It is an existential encounter in which the disciple is called to discard the worldly and to decide for Jesus Christ: "The faithful man is grounded in the past (the death and resurrection of Jesus) only in so far as he is called to eschatological existence through it, he who is oriented toward the future."[61] Pain is characteristic of the man who is caught up in the eschatological decision, but joy is an essential part of that pain since the decision issues in eschatological existence. At the opposite extreme of Dodd's exegesis is Stählin who sees in the passage a genuine eschatology depending on the impending parousia, and it brings from Jewish apocalyptic an immanent, inner-worldly character.[62] Between the death of Jesus and his coming again is the distress (_Not_) of the time in which his own do not see him and "the hope of the parousia remains, whether it is already more or less (überall mehr oder weniger) in the background."[63]

---

[54] Thomas has said that they (the disciples) do not know where Jesus is going and therefore do not know the way to follow after Jesus (14:4,5). The subject is the way with no emphasis on the "where." There the conversation sets up the following three exhortatory pericopae in that they center on the way of following Jesus. In 16:5 the statement of Jesus turns to the where of his departure. In so doing, Jesus attempts to turn the grief of the departure into the joy of recognition which is given with the place to which Jesus goes.

[55] See the discussion later on the function of the Paraclete, p. 116ff.

[56] In John 7:33 Jesus speaks these words to the Jews, and in 13:33 he speaks them to the disciples. In addition, the theme of seeing but not seeing is presented in a similar manner in 8:21; 12:35; 13:36; and 17:24.

---

[57] C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, p. 377.

[58] Bernhard Weiss, *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1893, p. 529.

[59] Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 410.

---

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 410.

[61] Bultmann, *Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 448, and this is discussed more generally on pp. 445-448.

An adequate analysis of these verses depends upon a careful consideration of the terminology which John utilizes. In considering the vocabulary found here it is evident that it possesses a close relationship to apocalyptic terminology and thought.

At the center of John's discussion in 16:16ff. is one of the few genuine parables to be found in his gospel,[64] the parable of the woman at childbirth. The parable comes from the Old Testament world of thought, most likely, and its importance for apocalyptic thought has been expressed by Russell. In speaking about the "Day of the Messiah or Yahweh" which is ushered in by portents and signs of a supernatural order showing the victory of God over his foes,

---

[62] Gustav Stählin, "Zum Problem der johanneischen Eschatologie," _ZNW_ 33 (1934), p. 239.

[63] _Ibid._, p. 242. Kundsin, in an article on johannine eschatology ("Die wiederkunft Jesu in den Abschiedsreden des Johannesevangeliums") agrees generally with Stählin in this respect. Kundsin's arguments will be viewed in more detail below.

[64] Dodd, _Historical Tradition_, pp. 366, 669.

Russell says:

> The name given in later Jewish and Christian writings to this period of disasters before God's final triumph is "travail pains of the Messiah." The idea goes back to Hosea 13:13 (cf. also Isa. 26:16-19; Micah 4:9-10; Hag. 2:6) and finds its way, through such passages as Zech. 14:13 and Dan. 12:1, into the main stream of apocalyptic thought. Within the New Testament it appears in the so-called "little apocalypse" of Mark 13 where the listed "woes" are called "the beginnings of the birth pangs" (13:8; cf. Mt. 24:8). The same idea is set forth at greater length in Revelation 12:1-6, where the writer describes the birth of the Messiah or the messianic community from the womb of the true Israel which is likened to a woman who "crieth out, travailing in birth, and in pain to be delivered." (12:2).[65]

This parable forces the acknowledgement that the relationship between the present tribultion and the coming joy is an essential one: joy is to be anticipated in the pangs of pain.[66] The parable does not offer a simple transition from woes to joy, but it expresses a relationship in which the joy is tied directly to, and is in one sense contained in, the pain.

---

[65] D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964, p. 272. Also in that context Russell quotes from the "Hymn of Thanksgiving" from the Dead Sea Scrolls (III.7-10), to Daniel 12:1. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, also views these verses as belonging properly to the Old Testament messianic resurrection imagery, p. 488. See also Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar, Vol. I, p. 950, and Sigmund Mowinckel, He That Cometh, translated by G. W. Anderson, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954, p. 272.

[66] As observed by B. F. Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1958, p. 233; and Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 446. This accords with the understanding of late Judaism as summarized by Volz: "Suffering is necessary . . . without suffering there is no salvation." Late Judaism is built on a theology of suffering on eschatological grounds and, therefore, "from the standpoint of the future suffering is bearable, comprehensible, indeed necessary." (Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2nd ed., 1934, pp. 127-128.)

Once again the disciples are called upon to face their present travails with confidence since such a life is an integral part of discipleship.[67] And, to be fair to John's discussion, it must be observed and concluded that such discipleship is caught up in the change of aeons which are advanced as an essential feature of apocalyptic. The hatred of the world (15:18ff) is already a clear reference to this.

There are other features contained in the pericope under discussion having importance for John's presentation which have a significant role in apocalyptic thought as well; namely, the *Weltanschauung* reflected in such terms as λύπη , κλαίειν , ϑρηνεῖν , and ϑλίψις . The parable of the woman at childbirth speaks bluntly about the distraught times of the johannine community. The terms just itemized are also words which signal the in-breaking of ominous times in apocalyptic literature. Grouped together at this point, these words speak forcefully of an apocalyptic setting, and such a setting is highlighted by the cosmic dualism presented here as well (verse 20: "Truly, truly I say to you: you will weep and lament, but the world [κόσμος] will rejoice."). By these close affiliations, it seems evident that the referent of these verses is not merely human emotions (i.e., the weeping and crying). On the contrary, the apocalyptic woes are the subject of the presentation. However, these tribulations are presented in the farewell discourse as already present for the church.

---

[67] This accords with Käsemann's conclusion that Christian preaching "had not only to exhort and warn, but also to comfort and to promise." There is a summons to obedience before the last judgment, but this preaching also places its hearers in joy and gratitude in reminding them of the past acts of God ("The Beginning of Christian Theology," *JTC* 6, 1969, p.35.). Wilder's conclusions concerning apocalypticists seem to suggest the present context as well: "The true apocalypticist aims at vindication of good and did not renounce effort but multiplies it in sacrifice and martyrdom" (*Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950, p. 30).

By arguing in such a manner, the evangelist once again, as in 15:18ff., shows that even though the disciples appear to be the losers now, frustrated by persecution, pain, and tribulation, they are really those who will be victorious over the forces of the cosmos. This is so because their lord has already conquered the world (16:33). A servant is not greater than his master (15:20) and in that assurance, or warning, is contained the further connotation that the disciple shares in the glory of his master as well. Yet, the disciple's joy in the world remains couched in faith, and not in the outward appearance of the present, for ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θλίψιν ἔχετε . The cosmic duel has already been won in Jesus' glorification by the father, and that is the sustaining hope of the faithful. That is the reminder the evangelist reiterates to his readers in their period of agony. The note of final joy is to be grasped already, even in the height of despair; that is the message of 16:16-22.

But what is to be made of the apocalyptic terminology in John? Is it a mere vestige of theological thinking which was once part of the apocalyptic thought world, but which can be employed now to advance a different theological message? For consideration of this issue a short statement as to the essence of apocalyptic may prove beneficial.[68]

Apocalyptic grew during the times of stress in the intertestamental period as a reaction against the destruction of the Jewish nation. It arose as a popular world-view which could place in perspective suffering, persecution, and death; and, as such, it emanated in exhortation calling the faithful to stand fast in their obedience to God and the torah until the imminent "Day of Yahweh" would break in upon the world. The Day of Yahweh would issue in an age when the messianic savior would destroy the forces of Satan and would institute the Golden age of Yahweh in which peace, blessedness, and prosperity would reign. Generally speaking, apocalyptic is grounded in a dualism which posits the present age as the time of evil, with Satan ruling over this period as the corruptor of the cosmos. Out of this dualism grows the hope in the coming judgment day of Yahweh when the wicked will be punished and the righteous will receive eternal life. Most often this includes the belief in resurrection from the dead.

---

[68] This is not a thorough treatment of the problems inherent in the summarization of the main tenets of apocalypticism (see Betz, "On the Problem of the Religio-historical Understanding of Apocalypticism," _JTC_ 6, 1969, pp. 134ff.) However, the summary can serve to put John in perspective with respect to apocalypticism. Russell, _The Method and Message of Apocalypticism_, still serves as a valuable overview of the subject. H. H. Rowley's work, _The Relevance of Apocalyptic_, is outmoded, even if it intends only to be a general survey of the subject.

Those who suffer now for their loyalty to God are not abandoned by God in the last times, but are sustained in their suffering by God and are soon to be rewarded by him with eternal life. All of this was expressed in cosmic imagery and through visionary forms of inspiration by means of bizarre images and circumlocutions.

Such a brief sketch is limited in its application, to be sure, but it does serve to point to the articulations of the apocalypticists which thrived on cosmic dualism, the immanent Day of Yahweh which would bring judgment to the wicked and life to the steadfast, the trials which the faithful must suffer at the hands of the evil powers now, and the visions concerning the messianic savior.

The discussion of this subject and its relationship to the discussion of the communal setting of the Gospel of John can be furthered by referring to a provocative essay by James Kallas[69] in which he attempts to show that the Apocalypse of John is not truly apocalyptic in nature. The crux of his argument rests on the contention that the essential touchstone of apocalyptic thought, quite apart from its imagery, is "its attitude toward the nature, purpose, and source of suffering."[70] In authentic apocalyptic, suffering is considered dualistically, which is to say that Satan and his forces, active in the cosmos, are the ones who cause suffering for the elect of the adversary God. Suffering is not retribution by God, as in the prophets and later New Testament writings (e.g., Hebrews, Letters of Ignatius); rather, it is caused by the forces opposed to God. Such a conclusion is used to proclaim as well that "if one is in sorrow now, in an evil or Satan-dominated world, that very sorrow is evidence that one is being attacked by Satan who has cunningly recognized that that person is a child of God, hence fair game for attack."[71] The reverse is also true, that if one is not suffering now then he has obviously sided with Satan. Since the Book of Revelation has given up thinking that evil originates in God-opposing forces, and has gone back to the retribution theory of evil, so Kallas argues, it is no longer apocalyptic.[72] Kallas' conclusion is important since he wished to study the Gospel of John from such a perspective also. Concerning John's gospel he concludes that realized eschatology has done away with the wait for the parousia, and, for John, Jesus is in full control here on earth, not the demons or Satan.

---

[69] James Kallas, "The Apocalypse--An Apocalyptic Book?" JBL (March, 1967), pp. 69-80.

[70] Ibid., p. 71.

Kallas' exegesis of John must be disputed, however. In fact, especially in the farewell discourse, it is obvious that the evil powers of Satan do in fact continue to have control over lives on earth, and no retribution theory is employed (ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων --14:30; 12:31; 16:11; τοῦ πονηροῦ --17:15;[73] ὁ Σατανᾶς --13:27; ὁ διάβολος --6:70; 8:44; 13:2. All of these references point to the continuing threat of Satan). The evangelist recognizes, and he states it explicitly, that the ruler of this world continues to do his business as usual, even though the Messiah has come. Jesus admits, to be sure, that the ruler of this world has no power over him (14:30), but throughout the farewell discourse there is the continual reminder that the threat of evil, as caused by the "evil one" is still present to haunt the disciples. The world gives only tribulation to those who fight on the side of the Messiah and God, and the prayer of Jesus pleads that the Father might "keep them from the evil one" while they are in the world (17:14). This is precisely the crux and dilemma of johannine eschatology, that whereas the Messiah has come and claimed his own for life, while his own are yet in the world they have (present tense, as 16:33 puts it) tribulation and death. So, the world and the ruler of this world are conquered--but! Evil still proceeds from the world and the Satan controlled forces.[74]

---

[71] Ibid., p. 75.

[72] Ibid., p. 77.

---

[73] Given the complete johannine context and concern, it seems clear that πονηροῦ should be translated as a masculine and not as a neuter.

[74] It is significant that Jesus does not cast out demons in John, as he is said to have done in the synoptics, and Jesus never conquers Satan in any match. It is likely that the evangelist realized that the cosmos and its evil powers stood over against Jesus and were at least his equal on earth. The one encounter ends in Jesus' death, even if that is supposedly willed by God.

Thus, if Kallas' observations concerning the "touchstone" of apocalyptic are correct, then the Gospel of John would indeed be apocalyptic in the manner by which it sets up the problem of evil.

With respect to the issue of dualism in John, it is fair to conclude that the structure is not merely an existential or decision dualism;[75] on the contrary, the way in which the issues are raised have a much more intimate relationship to the intended content than such a statement implies. Thus, one can argue that the dualism of John does rest upon an apocalyptic understanding of the cosmos. The continual mention of Satan and the evil powers gives support to this conclusion. The persecution and hatred displayed by the world (15:18ff) is itself an apocalyptically conceived situation. There _is_ a cosmic dualism at home in the thinking of the evangelist. As a whole, the farewell discourse exhibits that the vocabulary of apocalyptic was readily at John's disposal, and its use suggests that the tribulations of the community were best to be comprehended within such a framework. Thus, the persecutions were joined to the traditions related to the Messiah and the Day of Yahweh, and the essential message intended was one of exhortation, comfort, and encouragement to those who continue to follow after Jesus.[76]

---

[75] As Bultmann, Faulhaber, Via, _et_. _al_. have argued. Structure implies content much more than such scholars are willing to admit.

In summarizing John's relationship to apocalyptic it is important to be careful not to confine the vastness of apocalyptic. Apocalyptic was fluid and developing when John wrote, and it was not restricted to a few "characteristics" and nothing more. If apocalyptic is studied phenomenologically, with the intention of seeking out the basic questions which are at the heart of its structure,[77] then it provides a fruitful subject of study with reference to John's gospel.

From the arguments advanced thus far in the discussion of the farewell discourse of John it appears sound to say that the basic concern of apocalyptic theology and that of John are closely related. If the problem producing apocalyptic theology is that "God's people (were) ruled by pagans from whom no emancipation was in sight,"[78] and if the persecution setting of the Fourth Gospel is taken seriously, then the two are posing the same kinds of questions: both must explain why God has allowed these wretched circumstances to occur. How can account be given for the continuing oppression of the elect?

---

[76] It is also true that John did not employ the bizarre figures and images of apocalyptic as commonly associated with that literature. Nor does he cast his main characters in the guise of other historical figures, as, for example, Daniel did when he wrote of Antiochus by referring to Nebuchadnezzar. These omissions would lend weight to the contention that John sought only to utilize apocalyptic images without being totally dependent upon them. However, that would also limit the possible expressions of apocalyptic more than is warranted.

[77] As L. Keck has done in an unpublished paper, "Apocalyptic and the New Testament," delivered before the Association of Disciples for Theological Discussion, November, 1968.

[78] Ibid., p. 4.

One issue at stake for apocalyptic is the redemption of creation and not redemption _from_ it as with gnosticism.[79] Whether John is concerned with this overarching concern is more difficult to conclude. He responds both positively and negatively to it; he strattles the fence. John affirms that Jesus has conquered the world (John 16:33) which in the context seems to be an escape from the confines of evil rather than a statement concerning redemption of the world. The dualism of John is cosmic. However, John's concern is more immediate than the effort for working out a neat theoretical exposé of the problem of creation. He is concerned to legitimate faith in a persecution situation.[80] This is the apocalyptic issue with which he works.

It has been argued that since God and world go together in apocalyptic theology and the present must be explained in terms of the future, since times are horrible now for God's elect, then apocalyptic works on a Now-Then historical (chronological) horizon.[81] John's relation to this schema is, to be sure, not neatly fixed. John speaks of "present eschatology," and ". . . insists that the believer has already passed through the Judgment and has eternal life Now."[82] However, two things must be said in response to this conclusion. One, this oversimplifies apocalyptic and overlooks the fact that apocalyptic *also* views life for the elect as already present in some sense. The righteous are assured of legitimation of their present faithfullness in the future "Then," which *does* justify their pious actions now. Two, the statement oversimplifies the Gospel of John. It misses the problem of the *theologia crucis* in the farewell discourse and the issue of persecution which gives the elect such difficulties while they are in the world. The presentation of John as an enthusiast's gospel and as an example of totally present eschatology has been widely acclaimed today,[83] however, such a boast concerning this gospel is not well founded. Such a generalization misses the issue of persecution and the problem of legitimizing faith itself in a time of the absence of Jesus--and even of God. So, even though John affirms the redemption of the gathered elect, he still poses the questions raised by the situation and attempts to answer them in a modified "Now-Then" schema. The faithful will one day depart to the abiding places where they will be free of troubled times; though they suffer, their pain will be turned into joy. A "Then" is still a needed assurance of the johannine community. The present life of the redeemed is still in a turbulent time.

---

[79] _Ibid_., p. 11.

[80] See the next section, "The Crisis of Faith" for a development of this, p. 108.

[81] Keck, "Apocalyptic," p. 1.

---

[82] *Ibid*., p. 11.

[83] E.g., this is certainly what Käsemann and Schweizer contend strongly.

The assertion of apocalyptic that ". . . nothing is fulfilled in any Now. That every moment, be it ever so pregnant, is unfulfilled because it is frustrated and mocked by the historical nexus in which it occurs and to whom it occurs; that every such moment leans into the future for its consummation,"[84] is both ratified and changed by John. That apocalyptic expects the visible redemption of the cosmos is something which John simply does not develop if he does adhere to it. Above, it was stated that John's understanding of cosmos is usually hostile to such a view, but there are lingering indications that John viewed the cosmos as God's creation and an object of his concern. Most likely, the times faced by the community addressed by John influenced his emphasis of presentation. John does remain, however, closely related to apocalyptic. Even though he does not carry through in bold fashion with visions, dreams, highly figurative language, etc.[85] He does delve into the question which mattered for apocalyptic, the question dealing with theodicy.[86]

---

[84] Keck, "Apocalyptic," p. 17.

[85] Chapter 16 does, indeed, have language which was at home in apocalyptic theology; yet, having said that, the language still does not partake of the full apocalyptic language filled with dreams, visions, etc. It is important to state that chapter 16 has not been deapocalypticized as Dodd thinks it has (Dodd, Historical Tradition, p. 416).

The parousia as John views it[87] is related to the theme of Christ's departure and return. Dodd is correct in observing that the coming is not that of traditional eschatology[88] or of apocalyptic commonly understood. It is a return to his own, his disciples, to those temporarily orphaned. It is not part of world-history, as such, but it refers rather to the covenantal history and promise. Yet, it should be noted that in the drama exhibited in the farewell discourse the reunion--even for the readers, the second level of the drama--is still evasive and seems yet to be consumated, even if already begun. If the persecutions described refer to the disciples reading the gospel, then the material of chapter 16 refers to them. If so, the pain is still with them with only the promise that their pain will be turned into joy. The error of many exegetes in interpreting John at this point has been to suppose that the Paraclete is Jesus reunited with his own. However, the Paraclete is the one who recalls the promise of Jesus to his own. The Paraclete is not the reunion; otherwise the gospel would reflect a pure Enthusiasmus. The Paraclete serves to help the disciples continue steadfast in their faithfulness to the covenant and its promises initiated by Jesus when he dwelled with his own. Accordingly, just as the 'abiding places' is future, so is the return of Jesus to his orphaned disciples in the world, i.e., the readers of John, also future.

---

[86] This is the issue which apocalyptic presses and attempts to explain, according to Keck, "Apocalyptic," especially p. 18-19.

[87] Even though the term for parousia does not occur in John, the return of Jesus as expressed by John is still bound, to a more or lesser degree, to the early Christian understanding of the parousia.

[88] Dodd, Historical Tradition, p. 417.

That John 16:18-22 is apocalyptically oriented accords well with the persecution motif which has been claimed for 15:18-16:1-4a. The apocalyptic terminology gives intense witness to the perils of the present for the readers in the johannine church.[89] An absolute and total statement concerning the apocalyptic or non-apocalyptic character of John's whole gospel is not demanded;[90] however, it is important to recognize the association which the evangelist has with apocalyptic and how it aids the themes which he develops, especially prominent in chapters 15 and 16.

---

[89] The presentation of the last discourse of Jesus, which is put on the night he was betrayed, and yet which has as its direction the ears of John's contemporaries, is also associated with apocalyptic. "John did not create the literary form of the two-level drama. It was at home in the thought world of Jewish apocalypticism." (Martyn, _History and Theology_, p. 127). In spite of caution with regard to Martyn's particular presentation of the two-level drama in John, it is evident that the farewell discourse is a two-level presentation. Actually, one could say that apocalyptic has nothing to do with the form of farewell discourse, since that form was in use much before the time of apocalyptic. However, during the intertestamental period the literary form was used increasingly in the service of apocalyptic eschatology. See the examples cited earlier in f.n. 6 for some comparative material of farewell discourses in intertestamental literature.

[90] While noting Ebeling's warning that we need to distinguish between apocalypses and individual sayings with an apocalyptic background. _JTC_ 6 (1969), p. 53.

Jesus' monologue is broken by the dramatic relief afforded by the supposed insight of the disciples in 16:25-30.[91] Although Jesus says that he continues to speak in figures (v. 25) the disciples are convinced that they know everything since Jesus has spoken so clearly (v. 29). But, once again, Jesus shows the disciples that they are too quick to say they are steadfast and understanding. In truth, they do not comprehend that they too are required to go the way of the lord (vs. 31-32). They do not yet understand that the way the master goes is the way interrupted by death at the hands of the satanic powers of the cosmos. In spite of their ignorance, Jesus yet bids them a last word of encouragement in closing his address to the disciples, a word which is still promise: "I have overcome the world." (v. 33).

The themes developed in chapter 15 and 16 are fundamental to chapters 13 and 14 as well. A brief analysis of these two chapters helps to clarify further the development of the persecution situation as already shown for 15:18-16:33.

John 13:1-38.--An introduction to the entire discourse is provided by 13:1-30 in which the major themes for the testimony and exhortation are established. Verse 1 provides the break from chapter 12 with a new chronological setting: the time preceding the Passover festival. This introductory setting relates the departure motif and Jesus' total commitment to his own, themes which form the essence of what follows in the discourse through chapter 17.

---

[91] This is a literary device which John utilizes often in his gospel narrative. Colwell and Titus refer to this as the dramatic use of the "stupid character" (The Gospel of the Spirit: A Study in the Fourth Gospel, Harper and Row, 1953, p. 43.) By this element the evangelist is able to advance his argument more dramatically. Chapters 13-14 reflect this construction (e.g., 13:8f., 36f.; 14:4-5,8,22), as well as the first 12 chapters (e.g., the Jews in 8:21ff.).

Verses 2-17 continue the introduction to the intentions of the discourse and is made up of two intertwined motifs, one subservient to, but not unimportant to, the other. What is expected of the disciples as told by means of a pronouncement story,[92] is the dominant theme. Yet, the work of Satan looms as a secondary theme which emerges as the dominant thought in vs. 18-30. Already in v. 2b Satan is shown to be at work and v. 10d confirms this once again.

The footwashing scene is the first substantive story of the last discourse. Whether or not this pronouncement story came to John out of the tradition is difficult to determine. Any earlier reference to the footwashing is lacking. At any rate, John has utilized this account to exhort the readers to, what Dodd calls, an _imitatio christi_.[93] Although Dodd thinks that these verses break with the true form of a pronouncement story, since the action of Jesus is given the weight of emphasis and the significance of the word of Jesus is de-emphasized,[94] that is only partially correct. Certainly the story is developed so as to give importance to the development of the story as such; but, both parts of the event (vs. 4-9 (10?) and 12-17) really build up to the word of Jesus: "A servant is not greater than his lord" (13:16). Simon Peter in vs. 6-9 plays the typical johannine character role as the unknowing figure, one who does not comprehend the intention of Jesus. The call of v. 12 to proper understanding is intended to make sure the footwashing scene is understood: the servant must follow the path of the master; he is no better than his lord.[95]

---

[92] Such is the term utilized by V. Taylor as an anglisized expression for Bultmann's _Schulgespräch_, which is what the footwashing story is. The pronouncement story is of value not for the sake of the narrative itself, but for the word of Jesus which summarizes the intent of the story (Taylor, _The Formation of the Gospel Tradition_, London: Macmillan and Co., 1964, pp. 63ff., and Bultmann, _History of the Synoptic Tradition_, trans. by John Marsh, New York: Harper and Row, 1963, pp. 54ff.). Also see Dodd, _Historical Tradition_, p. 62.

[93] _Ibid._, p. 63. Cf. also below, Chapter 3.

Immediately following this scene comes a shift to the second theme of the introduction, only slightly touched upon in the first 17 verses; the action of Satan. Once again the johannine composition is pronounced in the role which the disciples play. They are, as a group, portrayed as those who do not understand. Although they ask questions, yet they do not understand the answers given to them. Verse 26 is John's narrative relating to the scriptural text of v. 18: the companion at table is the betrayer. Judas is the ploy for Satan.

---

[94] Ibid.

[95] This saying appears to be a traditional one which has come down to John. It is similar in content, and certainly in meaning, to that in Matthew 10:24-25: a disciple is not above his teacher nor a servant above his lord. Dodd is perceptive in pointing out that John's saying does not seem to be dependent upon the Matthean since John has used ἀπόστολος here for the only time whereas, if he had known the Matthean form which included John's favorite word μαθητής he would surely have employed that form (Dodd, Historical Tradition, pp. 325-338). Again, evidence tends to confirm that the traditional pieces which John did utilize were different from that used by the synoptic writers.

These two themes, the exhortation for the servant to follow the ὑπόδειγμα of the master and the work of Satan against the one sent by God, provide the foundation and setting for the words of the farewell discourse. The two themes are represented as well, even if in slightly different construction, in the introductory words of the second major division of the last discourse: 13:31-16:33.

At the outset of this section John divulges the basic content of the discourse to follow with a brief, but vital, summary in vs. 31-38. With the departure of Judas to do Satan's work and the moment at hand of Jesus' death, the response of Jesus is one of joy since now is the time of his glorification. But the glorification (vs. 31-32) means his departure, and that departure brings with it a need for a new commandment to the community (33-35). Thereupon, in a style typically johannine, Peter serves once again as the one who cannot comprehend what Jesus means (vs. 36-38). John, as do the synoptics, records the prediction of Peter's denial of his lord. Although Peter is told that he will one day follow Jesus, Peter does not comprehend the total commitment Jesus has in mind. Thus, the introductory words of Jesus to his select few, minus the presence of Judas, in vs. 31-38 relate

(1) his coming glorification in death, (2) the new commandment essential for his followers when he has departed, and (3) the folly of the disciples and their misunderstanding of the hardship and total stance demanded in discipleship to Jesus. These items are then broadened in the remainder of the second division, 14:1-16:33.

John 14:1-31.--14:1-31 provides a general discussion concerning the way to follow Jesus. Verses 1-3 add a note of consolation and hope to the announcement of Jesus' departure and to the statement that the disciples cannot follow him now. He has departed for the benefit of the disciples. After the word of hope, John again introduces disciples, now Thomas and Phillip, to play into the constructed conversation and to act the parts of unintelligent dramatic characters (vs. 4-14). The conversation builds to the word of Jesus in v. 12: "ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, he who believes in me will do the works which I do, and even greater works than these he will do because I am going to the father." The departure of Jesus, in crucifixion, is a blessing since thereby the disciples will be led to life through their response in faithfulness.

The departure theme is also the setting for a new addition to John's gospel, that of the Paraclete figure in vs. 15-21. However, this pericope continues to another word of Jesus similar to the climax of vs. 4-14, and that is the statement that the one who loves Jesus is the one who has received his commands and obeys them. Again, the close of a pericope goes back to the introduction of the section in 13:34 where the commandment is given to love one another. An identical emphasis is given to the conversation with Judas is vs. 22-24 where Jesus repeats that the one who loves him heeds what he says.

14:25-27 concludes the line of thought begun in 14:1. The Paraclete will be the sure sign that Jesus is present with them, even though absent, and the Paraclete will be the guarantor of the tradition. μὴ ταρασσέσθω closes the section just as it began it in 14:1. A note of comfort over Jesus' departure is given both at the beginning and end of this concentrated conversation. Following those comforting words, 14:28-31 summarizes the discourse and re-emphasizes the two prominent motifs: the departure of Jesus and Satan's hand in this (John still does not admit that Jesus was crucified; his terms remain more ambiguous). The words which conclude this chapter have bewildered those exegetes who have attempted to take seriously the structure of the farewell discourse as a whole: ἐγείρεσθε , ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν . Because of them, Bultmann feels obliged to rearrange the text since they apparently lead to 18:1ff., which indicates that a dislocation of the text has occurred.[96] Because of the disruption Schneider thinks that we must posit two separate discourses: 13-14; and 15-16.[97] But it is Dodd who proposes a more sound approach to the problem. He neither thinks that there is a dislocation of the text nor that there are two discourses, one of which ends with the words under consideration. He insists that the evangelist be given a chance to say what he will without superimposed interruptions. And, he contends that much of the difficulty is already overcome if one puts these three words in relation to the preceding context. By so doing it becomes clear that they refer to the coming of Satan and Jesus, by using them, is calling on his forces to go out boldly to meet the opposing power: "Arise, let us go out from here to meet him!"[98] Dodd is correct in his interpretation; he alone is fair to the immediate context in which the words are set.[99]

---

[96] Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, pp. 348-351.

---

[97] J. Schneider, "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Komposition von Joh. 13.31-17.26: in Gott und die Götter, Festgabe für E. Fascher, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958, pp. 103-112. Barrett follows Schneider in this conclusion and he points to the themes which are supposedly common to both discourses (Barrett, pp. 379-380): Jesus' relation to the Father: 14:6f., 9ff., 28; 15:10, 23f., 16:15; 17:1f., 8, 10, 21-26. Departure to the Father and Coming Again: 14:2f., 18-20, 22f., 28; 16:5-7, 22, 28; 17:11, 13. His Revelation of the Father: 14:9; 17:6, 26. Prayer in His Name: 14:13f.; 16:23f., 26; cf. 15:1. Keeping His Commandments: 14:15, 21, 23; 15:10, 12-14, 17. Paraclete: 14:16f., 26; 15:26; 16:7-15. Peace Jesus Gives: 14:27, cf. 14:1; 16:33. Judgment of Prince of World: 14:20; 16:11, cf. 16:33.

In spite of the impressive list, this does not resolve the problem. Consideration should still be given to the possibility that 15:1ff. merely carries on the one farewell discourse and that the themes are naturally going to be similar throughout, which they are.

[98] Dodd, Historical Tradition, p. 72.

These words, therefore, do not need to imply a movement from the present physical scene of action, i.e., the dinner, although 18:1 does not necessarily preclude that.[100]

John 15:1-17.--What follows in chapter 15 in the metaphor of the vine (which can be divided into 15:1-10 and 11-17) is an intriguing development of the discourse. The metaphor of the vine, in its passion setting, is closely parallel to Mk. 11:20-26 and Mt. 29:20-22 and the common story of the cursing of the fig tree. Later discussion will demonstrate that the talk of John centers on the tree of life figure and not on the vine itself.[101] John talks of bearing fruit or not bearing fruit, just as in the curse of Jesus to the fig tree. The similarity appears to be too striking to be merely coincidental. Once again there appears to be evidence which shows the diversity of tradition, yet diversity which has intriguing points of contact within the chronological framework of the larger parts of the tradition, such as with the passion accounts.

---

[99] It is intriguing that the words spoken here are similar to those of Mark 14:42: εγείρεσϑε, ἄγωμεν . As well, the Markan words are spoken in the context of the hour of betrayal. This traditional scene appears to have been firmly in John's mind, even though he has changed the meaning of the exclamation a bit. In John the emphasis is placed more on a bold confrontation rather than on a submission as indicated in Mark. Of further interest with respect to Mk. 14:42-43 is the fact that 14:43 reports that Jesus was still speaking after his announcement of the approach of his betrayer. Yet, since no words accompany the general statement of the tradition there appears to be no radical break. Since John continues the speech of Jesus after "arise, let us go forth (to meet him)," just as Mark reported that he did, it is questionable whether much ado should be made over this supposed break in John. If the traditional advance of the passion account caused no great disturbance for one gospel, it likely should not cause disturbance for a second gospel reporting a similar event.

[100] ἐξῆλϑεν (18:1) need not mean: "get up and go." It can mean simply "retire." Thus, even if 15:1 is taken as a change of scene, that is possible so far as 18:1 is concerned.

[101] See the discussion in chapter 3, pp. 178ff.

In 15:1-10 the vine metaphor concludes with the statement that he who heeds Jesus' commands is the one who will dwell in Jesus' love.[102] This is followed by vs. 11-17 in which the command of loving one another is repeated and forcefully illustrated with the wisdom piece of 15:13: "There is no greater love than this, that a man should lay down his life for his friends." The pericope ends with a repetition of the command, tying 15:1-10 and 11-17 into a neat bond. Following this, the scene shifts once again to focus upon the evil powers opposing both Jesus and his disciples.

The situation presupposed in chapters 13-15:17 is idential with the tribulation motif rendered by the evangelist in 15:18-16:33. One strong defender of such a conclusion is Karl Kundsin. He has argued persuasively that the farewell discourse is developed from the presupposition of martyrdom,[103] and his analysis of the text is executed in a manner quite sympathetic to that discussed above. "Without question," he writes, "for chapters 13-17 of the gospel the situation is the imminent passion, martyrdom," as 13:1 makes clear from the start, and "in that the farewell discourses speak of the martyrdom of Jesus, they speak at the same time, whether explicitly or implicitly, of the martyrdom of the disciples."[104] Associated with this conclusion are John 13:16; 15:13-14; 15:18ff; 16:1-3; and 21:19, all of which speak to such a situation and are central to the thought of the entire last discourse. Kundsin then proceeds to argue that John, having the dire times of the disciples in mind, encompasses the major portion of chapter 14 with the exhortation: μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία (14:1 and 14:27), and at the conclusion of 14:27 he adds the further explicative μηδὲ δειλιάτω . Kundsin argues that 14:1-3 are to be explained totally from the referent just stated. When Jesus talks of the many rooms in his father's house he is obviously speaking not for his own comfort which he will enjoy when he has departed; rather, in telling of his preparation of a place for the disciples he is speaking to the need of the disciples themselves when they have been martyred. Accordingly, verse 3 relates the coming of Jesus to the disciples in their Todesstunde, in their hour of martyrdom.[105] At this juncture, Kundsin wishes to include as a part of the total argument the appeals to prayer which are scattered throughout the discourse (e.g., 14:13-14; 15:7-8; 15:16; 16:23-24; 16:26) to the basic theme of martyrdom also. Such references to prayer are to be compared with the prayer of Stephen (Acts 7:59, 60) in which Stephen prays to be received up by the Lord at the time of his martyr's death. Because of the decided emphasis upon imminent persecution, the former expectation of the Messiah returning to establish the righteous here on earth has been changed into a "mystic, inner, consoling (tröstlich) understanding."[106]

---

[102] It is the metaphor of the vine which is the important item here. The ἄμπελος saying which opens these verses is of secondary concern for the emphasis lies with the community here and not with the revealer *per se*. It is likely that this is an introduction taken from the Mandean thought world as Schweizer and Becker have attempted to show (cf. E. Schweizer, *Ego Eimi*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965, pp. 64ff.; and H. Becker, *Die Reden des Johannes-evangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956, pp. 8ff.).

---

[103] Karl Kundsin, "Die Wiederkunft Jesus in den Abschiedsreden des Johannesevangeliums," *ZNW* 33 (1934), pp. 210-215.

[104] *Ibid*., pp. 211-212.

An interesting suggestion of Kundsin's argument is the connection which he makes between prayer and the theme of martyrdom. The one persecuted for the faith is promised that whatever he asks in Jesus' name (e.g., John 14:13) will be granted. Intercessory prayer by the martyred on behalf of his compeers became one of the prizes of suffering[107] and

---

[105] Ibid., p. 213. 14:23 relates this same thought.

[106] Ibid., p. 211.

[107] As discussed by Donald Riddle, The Martyrs. A Study in Social Control, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931, p. 36.

Kundsin's association of the martyr and prayer is likely correct. Kundsin's reconstruction of the situation of the johannine church in the farewell discourse as a period of tribulation and fear is well founded and helps to support the argument of this paper.[108]

The disciples are no longer called servants, but they have become Jesus' friends and brothers, and they partake, as such, for _his_ name's sake (15:21) his fate of suffering and persecution in this world.[109] Campenhausen also places John within the framework posited by this monograph. However, he connects the examples given in the farewell discourse to the examples of intertestamental Judaism and early Christianity where the emphasis is placed on the faithfulness to the law and obedience to the command of God.[110] Martyrdom, Campenhausen argues, has the very special connotation of Blutzeugnis, and, he contends, this arose only in second century Christianity as a full-fledged stance.[111] Before that time it is incorrect to speak of martyrs. However, his own examples do show that John is at least on the threshhold of such thinking, if not totally committed to this supposition. Of the true martyrology Campenhausen says: "In dying is fulfilled the witness duty which is placed on every Christian. The witness remains in the church until the last triumph; but each individual has to answer whether he will remain 'true' and remain firm in the witness of Jesus if persecution comes."[112] The idea of following (Nachfolge) refers, in such cases, to a similarity of the fate of Jesus.[113]

---

[108] Bultmann rejects Kundsin's argument, at least with respect to 16:16-24. He argues that if the passage had to do with the mythological concepts of parousia and heaven then the disciples would have comprehended Jesus easily. But as it stands, it represents a totally different way of looking at the situation, i.e., as present possibility (_Johannes-Evangelium_, p. 447; also n. 5). However, in spite of Bultmann's argument, the fact remains that the mythological speech is vital for John's gospel and eschatology. It might be the case that in the last analysis the content (_Sache_) and meaning might be very similar to Bultmann's notion, but that is a different argument from Bultmann's analysis that the truly eschatological references were added by the redactor (p. 447, 451, 469). Stählin also concurs with and supports Kundsin's analysis in speaking of the eschatological character of John and of his awaiting of the parousia as traditionally conceived in apocalyptic-eschatological thought. It is important that such eschatological features not be deleted from the picture or study of John for, as Dodd has pointed out, even though such language is not widely used by John "we need not regard such expectations as merely vestigial remains of the eschatology of the primitive Church. They are a part of the evangelist's own faith." (_Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel_, p. 7). Via also insists that these are the _traditional_ terms of the parousia of the Messiah ("Darkness, Christ, and the Church in the Fourth Gospel," _SJT_ 14 (1961), p. 7, n. 42).

[109] H. von Campenhausen, _Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche_, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964, p. 56.

Yet, to draw the distinction sharply as to what is martyrological thinking and what is only a forerunner to it as Campenhausen has done actually simplifies a more complex process. There is no one point of precise conceptualization of martyrdom as his study tends to urge. Surkau and Riddle both present the process in better perspective.[114] Surkau demonstrates that the use of hero models who died in faithfulness was extensive in intertestamental Judaism, and, from the time of the Maccabees forward, was common in literature which exhorted its readers to steadfastness in times of persecution. And, he is prepared to call such models martyrs.[115] In this respect, Christians used heros of faith both from Judaism and their own members who died in steadfastness to the faith (e.g., Hebrews 11).[116] Riddle comes at the problem from third and fourth century martyrological literature. By looking first at the truly martyrological writings he concludes that the most thorough presentation of Jesus as the martyr is given in the Fourth Gospel.[117] Since Jesus is presented there as going to his death voluntarily, by that act he draws his own to himself--that is the act of the true martyr. Thus, John does contain an interest in Jesus as a martyr and this interest is tied to the persecution situation of the community to whom John addresses his gospel.

---

[110] Ibid., see pp. 3 and 37.

[111] Ibid., p. 41.

[112] Ibid., p. 45.

[113] Ibid., p. 8.

[114] H. W. Surkau, Martyrien in jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1938, and D. Riddle, The Martyrs.

As has been demonstrated above, the purpose of the farewell discourse is the comfort of those facing persecution and the attempt at arousing such to steadfastness. It presents the alternatives as life on earth--which is death, since it means a selling-out to the powers of this world; and death at the hand of persecutors in the impending times--which is really life. The alternatives given point to the martyr's death as one's ultimate witness and, as such, as a witness which has to do with the "Irrevocable sealing of his witness through death."[118]

---

[115] Surkau, Martyrien, p. 7. W. Farmer emphasizes the important role of the Maccabeen martyrs for later Judaism during the time of Jesus. The zealousness of the Maccabees for the law and the temple and their faithfulness made them prototypes par excellence for both the Zealots and the moderate groups (Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus, New York: Columbia University Press, 1956, esp. pp. 177-186).

[116] Ibid., pp. 143-144.

[117] Riddle, The Martyrs, p. 205.

John 17.--Chapter 17 only supports the preceding contentions and arguments. It appears as a summary to the thoughts expressed in the other chapters of the farewell discourse.

Structurally, it ends the discourse form with the prayer of the departing one, and this prayer is expressive of the covenantal meaning of the discourse. It reiterates who "Jesus' own" (v. 6ff.) are and predicts their hatred at the hand of the world (v. 14ff.) Verses 6-19 reintroduce the important schema: the servant is not greater than his lord. Just as Jesus has kept the word given to him by the father, so _have_ the disciples kept it (v. 6--an interesting tense in light of the total lack of understanding on the part of the disciples throughout the discourse and the prediction of Peter's falling away in 13:38 and that of all the disciples in 16:32). Just as the world hated Jesus so now it has hated (again aorist) them (v. 14). Just as Jesus was sent into the world, so now does he send them into the world for a similar fate (v. 18). And finally, the appeal is made that they be one just as the son and father are one (v. 20ff.).

---

[118] Campenhausen, _Die Idee des Martyriums_, p. 56. No doubt the use of specific terminology is important in John, as Campenhausen has suggested (i.e., John uses _martyria_ and _martyrein_ and not _martyrion_ or _martyrethai_: both of the latter terms came to be technical terms for expressing true martyrological contexts, p. 36); however, the ideas expressed in John's farewell discourse do fit with Campenhausen's other requirements for martyrology and it is fair to conclude that John is associated with such thinking.

The thrust of the two level drama is certainly manifest here with the changing of the tenses, as mentioned. It is all the more apparent that John is concerned to speak to the community of his own time here since this chapter exhibits several contradictions to the time of the disciples of Jesus as given in 13-16. And that thrust supports and sustains what has been said earlier about chapters 13-16 and its situation, for here the prayer to God is that the disciples might be kept from the evil one (v. 15), that they might be sanctified (v. 17), that they might be consecrated in the truth (v. 19), and that they all might be of one mind, in understanding, endurance, and hope (v. 20ff.). The exhortatory tone of this prayer intends to encourage its readers to faithfulness and to the total consequences of their covenantal commitments. And this itself leads to a question concerning the need for such exhortation, and the communal situation demanding such. That question finds its answer in the crisis of faith in the community.[119]

---

[119] Now that an analytical basis has been established for the movement and intent of the farewell discourse, the

C. The Communal Situation: The Crisis of Faith

The crisis which is precipitated by the persecution situation has, as one of its component parts, the crisis of faith itself. The gospel writer incorporates and responds to this facet of the circumstances in the farewell discourse. The time of desperation and fear for life invokes, for John, the question how one as a follower of Jesus is to respond to life. An essential ingredient of such a response is the fundamental issue whether or not the Christian's faith is surely grounded, and, therefore, whether it is true.[120]

The Loss of the Earthly Jesus

By giving consideration to this problem, John answers

---

sequential structure of the discourse may now be summarized as follows: 1. 13:1-30 (1-17; 18-30) presents the major themes of the discourse to follow. 2. 13:31-38 (31-33; 34-35; 36-38) begins the discourse proper and outlines the specific themes of the discourse. 3. 14:1-31 (1-3; 4-14; 15-21; 22-24; 25-27; 28-31) discusses the way to follow Jesus. 4. 15:1-17 (1-10; 11-17) introduces the metaphor of the vine and climaxes the exhortatory discourse. 5. 15:18-16:4a (18-21; 22-25; 26-27; 16:1-4a) focuses on the second major theme, the hatred of the world. 6. 16:4b-33 (4b-15; 16-24; 25-30; 31-33) illumines the departure and glorification of Jesus. 7. 17 summarizes what has gone before.

[120] Dodd sees the crisis of faith as at the heart of the purpose for the gospel; however, he is unable to specify the reason for that as either 1) persecution or 2) the loss of Jesus. Dodd reports:

> He [John] sees them [his readers] floundering in the midst of the truth, and he takes up his pen in order to save them from ignorant misunderstanding . . . But when this has been said, it is by no means clear what that situation really was, or why it seemed to him so precarious, so heavy with ultimate significance (Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 43).

to one of the central concerns of the early Christian community in general, and certainly one of the key concerns of the community to which he writes. That concern deals with the loss of the earthly Jesus.

Jesus, the crucified, is gone; the eyewitnesses appear to have departed also, and thus the problem of continuity emerges: the lord of faith is no longer here and the promised parousia has not occurred so is there any hope left for the followers of the faith in this period of despair?[121] Is there continuity between the departed lord and the ones who follow after him now, those who live during the final decades of the first century A.D. And what is the quality of such a continuity if it is there? This problem in particular underlies the development of the farewell discourse.[122] However, given the supposition that the farewell discourse affords the proper starting point for the interpretation of

---

[121] Martyn has expressed this concern and dilemma of faith precisely: "This turn of events [Jesus' departure] is bound to put fear into the hearts of Jesus' disciples. They are left behind in 'enemy territory' without their leader. From their point of view the Lord is departing in mid stream" (History and Theology, p. 137). Käsemann's contention that the present Christ is the middle of John's message really distorts and misapprehends the ominous tone which results from the lord's continued absence. (Käsemann, Jesu letzter Wille, p. 33.)

[122] A resolution of this problem is attempted in the figure of the Paraclete. He is the abiding continuity with the earthly Jesus. But he is not equal with Jesus, as will be shown below. He continues the consoling words and exhortations during the period of the community's persecutions just as Jesus did with his disciples during his own tormented times.

John's intentions in writing a gospel at all, it is apparent that such an issue, if it is really in evidence, would be of great help in giving proper perspective to the thrust of the gospel.

Bultmann aptly perceives the crisis of belief situation facing the community from the evidence given in the farewell discourse when he discusses the setting for the last discourse. The discussion revolves around the perception that "he, who is leaving the world, is contrasted with those who still remain in the world . . . (17:11f; 15:18f; 16:28ff; 14:1ff.)."[123] Such circumstances, Bultmann asserts, lead to the general theme of the farewell discourse:

> It is the theme which was already announced in 12:20-33, the problem of the departure of the revealer, the problem of the distance, the question concerning the relationship of the believers to the revealer after the direct, personal relationship has ceased. The theme is, therefore, the indirectness (Indirektheit) of the revelation.[124]

The experience associated with the departure of the revealer Jesus, and of his continued absence, stands behind the discussion constituting the farewell address. In responding to this situation, John has adeptly made the *loss* of the earthly revealer the *key* to the *positive* truth of the Christians' faith in Jesus. Thus, for John the proof of the truth of the faith becomes precisely the departure of Jesus itself. This conclusion is supported at various places throughout chapters 13-17.

---

[123] Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 373.

[124] Ibid. Franz Mussner, in Die johannesische Sehweise und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus, Freiburg: Herder, 1965 (English: The Historical Jesus in the Gospel of St. John, trans. by W. J. O'Hara, New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), also stresses the importance of this problem for John. He says that John's difficulty is that of going back to a figure who died 60 years before and then to work him into the christological problems of his own church in order to answer the question, who was Jesus Christ really (pp. 13-14). The discussion above is attempting to formulate the issues in a way similar to that of Mussner's summary here.

14:28-29 is the first overt reference to the author's conviction concerning the issue: "You have heard that I said to you: I am going away and am coming to you. If you loved[125] me you would have rejoiced because I am going to the father, because the father is greater than me. Now I have told you before it happens, in order that you might believe when it does happen." The disciples are told here that the proper response toward the departure should be one of joy, not of despair and sadness. The very fact of the departure is a sign of Jesus' glorification and, hence, a worthy justification of the disciples' confidence.[126] The earlier discussion (pp. 64ff.) ought to be recalled here, in which a part of John's methodology was investigated which centered upon the theme of remembrance and how that idea was employed to read back into Jesus' words instruction for the present johannine community. Here that method has been used in an attempt to overcome the crisis of faith by turning the sad event of the death of Jesus into a joyful occasion. The disciples need reassurance, and John responds by changing the emphasis of a past event into one which speaks to the needs of the community.

---

[125] A few manuscripts have the present tense here (D*HLφal), and that is likely an attempt to rid the difficulty of the aorist viewed as a strictly past tense.

[126] Corell is correct in saying that "for John the right faith in Jesus as the Messiah and, consequently, the confession inspired by the faith, are possible only after the death and resurrection of Jesus; that is, in the church" (Corell, *Consummatum est*, p. 10). However, Corell fails to see or take seriously the real problem which is the *absence* of Jesus and the crisis of faith which that absence *brought* about. Other scholars have observed the same thing which stands behind the johannine text: e.g., Mussner, *Die johanneische Sehweise*, p. 42; Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 409; Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, Vol. 2, p. 42.

That saying of 14:28-29 is in agreement with 14:3 where the departure of Jesus is the necessary event for the preparation of a place (τόπον) for the disciples with Jesus, which is an obvious reference to the future resurrection of his followers.[127] In addition, chapter 16 provides several examples in which the death of Jesus is presented as the precipitator through which the disciples will be brought to understanding and knowledge. 16:20-23 dramatically presents the departure as the element by which the disciples will be granted joy (vs. 2, 22). With the parable of the woman in travail the author reinforces his case that the departure is required for the life which is to follow from it. Such is posited in 16:7 and 16:12 as well. In 16:7 Jesus says emphatically that it is to the disciples' advantage (συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω) that he depart, because "If I do not depart the Paraclete will not come to you. But if I depart I will send him to you." 16:12 adds to the "advantage" created by Jesus' leave taking by the claim that the Spirit of Truth will continue to speak for Jesus such things which the disciples are not able to bear while Jesus is still with them.

---

[127] This is so regardless of form critical judgments as to its inappropriateness in this johannine section (14:1-14:31). Such is a vital part of johannine theology, if one is to attempt to deal with the Gospel of John as it stands in relationship to its intended purpose. It is not isolatable but stands in conjunction with other parts of the johannine world view.

Another facet of this same problem of crisis in faith is divulged in the relationship of the disciples to Jesus in the last discourse. Contrary to expectation, the disciples stand in the same relationship to Jesus in these chapters as did the Jews in the first twelve chapters.[128] The Jews were filled with misunderstanding when they confronted Jesus (e.g., 6:52; 7:35; 8:13; 8:22-27; 8:48-52) and on the last night of Jesus' earthly life the disciples are represented, likewise, as being void of proper understanding.[129] Certain disciples are singled out by name: Peter, 13:9; 13:36; Thomas, 14:5; Philip, 14:8; Judas, not Iscariot, 14:22. In each of these instances the disciples ask Jesus a question and the dialogue which takes place between Jesus and these individuals demonstrates that they comprehend the message and mission of Jesus as little as did the Jews beforehand. A vivid portrayal of such misunderstanding on the part of the disciples as a whole is presented in 16:25-32. There, Jesus talks about the time when he would (future) speak to them plainly using no figures of speech. Immediately upon completion of his enigmatic talk the disciples confidently proclaim that they now understand because Jesus has spoken to them plainly. To their misunderstanding Jesus retorts caustically that they in reality do not yet comprehend.[130] From this description of the disciples and their relationship with Jesus, it becomes evident that the evangelist gives little, if any, special place to the eye-witness companions of Jesus, which suggests that he is interested in the affairs of his present community, rather than with careful reconstruction and use of tradition for its own sake in verifying faith. Now is the time of understanding, not in the days gone by because now through the Paraclete the disciples are brought to remembrance of Jesus' sayings. Even those closest to Jesus did not comprehend until after the glorification, i.e., the time when Jesus departed from the scene. By such a characterization, the evangelist implies that there was no inherent advantage of the disciples of the earthly Jesus over those who now follow long after Jesus' departure and glorification.[131] Even for the earthly disciples proof of the truth of Jesus' claims was forthcoming only after the time when Jesus was no longer present. Once again, John utilizes the device of the recollection after his glorification of the sayings of Jesus. Jesus had already told everything before his death, but the disciples could not then comprehend what he meant; such things had to be recalled and understood post resurrectio (e.g., 14:25; 14:29; 16:4). The frustration caused by the indirectness of the revelation, now that the earthly Jesus was no longer accessible, is thus solved by John in his demonstration that the death and departure of Jesus are in fact, as Jesus himself had said, proof of the truth of his revelation. In this attempt, John seeks to overcome the despair of the community at the continued absence of its Lord.[132]

---

[128] The parallel relationship of the disciples in the farewell discourse to that of the Jews in the first part of the gospel has been observed and discussed by a host of commentators, including Bultmann, *Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 445; Corell, *Consummatum est*, p. 10; and Mussner, *Die johanneische Sehweise*, p. 32.

[129] The misunderstanding theme, according to Wrede, is given expression at 14:5, 7, 8, 11, 23, 24, 25, 26; 16:16; and 16:30.

---

[130] Mussner is simply incorrect in assuming that after 16:22 the misunderstandings of the disciples are changed to clarity, for 16:31 is a total rebuff to the supposed clarity.

---

[131] Bultmann affirms such a conclusion when he speaks of the meaning of chapter 17: "there is no material difference between the time of the eyewitnesses and the time of the later generation," Johannes-Evangelium, p. 386.

[132] I. G. Simpson, "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," Ex, 9th Series, 4 (1925), draws a similar conclusion when he reports: "The Fourth Gospel was, we believe, written at a very critical period of the Church's history and at a time when faith was at an ebb. Many who had looked for Jesus to return in the flesh were perplexed and disappointed" (p. 297). Simpson's judgment is fine, so far as it goes, but he does not look to the broader context of the impinging persecution and fear of death which accompany and, in part, help to produce the disappointment and crisis of faith.

The Paraclete and Jesus

At this juncture it is instructive to take a brief look at the figure of the Paraclete in John's gospel and the role he plays in the period when Jesus has been "glorified."[133]

The basic question to be answered in such a consideration is the reason and function of the Paraclete's coming. That question can best be solved within the context which has been mentioned in connection with the discussion above and the crisis of faith. Thus, the essential enigma of the Paraclete, as far as this study is concerned, is brought to bear when the question is posed as to why there is a need to bring in this figure at all in speaking to the community. If Bultmann's existential analysis of the theology of John were sufficient and consistently carried through in the gospel, would not mere belief in Jesus suffice? Such belief is at least hinted at in the first eleven chapters (e.g., 3:36; 5:24; 6:47; 8:51). But the issue remains: when the thrust of the farewell discourse is taken into consideration the issue arises that if Jesus is the true revealer why is there a need still for one to come after him? At best the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, would seem a poor "second" for the revealer himself. The setting of the discussion suggests, at least, that these questions concerning the Paraclete are tied to the dilemma of the departure and continued absence of Jesus, the revealer and Lord. Bornkamm has concluded that the problem is best seen as this: the same Jesus who in chapter three is called the last revealer and the bringer of salvation is here (in the Paraclete speeches of the farewell discourse) himself placed in the role of an eschatological forerunner.[134] Brown concurs in this conclusion when he says that the use of the Paraclete figure responds to two problems: the first is the distance between the time of the church and the time of Jesus, and the second problem is that of the delay of the awaited parousia.[135] With these overbearing issues in mind, the function of the Paraclete according to the evangelist can be considered in more detail.

---

[133] The discussion to follow centers on one primary aspect of the Paraclete figure. For fuller treatments of the history of research on the Paraclete, including the possible historical background from which this figure might have emerged, see: O. Betz, Der Paraklet, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963, and J. Blank, Krisis, Freiburg im Breisgau: Lambertus-Verlag, 1964, both of which have excellent summaries as well as suggestive insights into this question. In addition, other more general and more concise summaries are included in Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, pp. 437-440; Bornkamm, "Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium," in Festschrift für Rudolf Bultmann, ed. by E. Wolf, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1949, pp. 12-35, where he relates the Paraclete to late Jewish apocalyptic; and R. Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," NTS 13 (1967), pp. 113ff., where a helpful summary of possible interpretations is presented.

---

[134] Bornkamm, "Der Paraklet," p. 23. Bornkamm's comment that the role of predecessor and fulfiller are turned around in John and the follower stands now in the service of Jesus still does not take away the brunt of the problem under discussion, namely, the need for the Paraclete at all.

[135] R. E. Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," pp. 128-130. Brown acknowledges that he is in agreement with Barrett here (cf. Barrett, "The Holy Spirit in John," JTS, new series, 1 (1950), pp. 1-15) that the idea of Spirit is used by John to explain why the triumphal return of Jesus did not take place immediately (p. 131). Brown contends that the hope for the second coming began to wane after 70 A.D., although he adds one interesting footnote in which he asserts: "Of course persecution could fan it to life again, as we see in the Book of Revelation (p. 131, n. 2)." As the argument of this paper has shown, this is precisely the problem faced by the johannine community, and it is within such a general purview that the need for the Paraclete figure is to be placed.

There appears to be no scholarly concensus in contemporary scholarship with respect to the interpretation of the function of the Paraclete in John. The gamut of possibilities encompasses the notions of: Beistand or Helper (Bornkamm, Bultmann, Grundmann, J. Weiss); prophet (Windisch, Bauer, Lightfoot, Schlatter, and with modifications of that, Betz and Barrett); advocate (Dodd, Hirsch); and one who merely brings to memory and thereby to understanding (Wrede, Westcott, Hoskyns).[136] The occurrences of the Paraclete in John (14:16; 14:26; 15:26; and 16:7)[137] certainly do not give a simple answer to this question, but, within the general issue being discussed here, namely, the absence of the revealer, the various references do form a Gestalt which presents a workable view of his office.

The first mention of the Paraclete comes in 14:16. But even here the translation of ἄλλον παράκλητον raises problems. Is it to be translated "another, namely a counselor (paraclete)" in which Paraclete is given the status of an aposition; or is the ἄλλον adjectively employed with the meaning of "another Paraclete"?[138] The second alternative appears as the more appropriate translation in that it conforms more closely with the usual johannine structural procedure. There are ample examples in John where he has used ἄλλος similarly.[139] 6:22 is the only deviation of this pattern where John uses πλοιάριον ἄλλο , which is clearly appositional. Thus, the adjectival "another Paraclete" is to be preferred as John"s intended meaning. But a translation such as this has wide ramifications, for then the Paraclete of John's gospel is a parallel figure to Jesus.[140] As such, the expectations are aroused in the community that whatever the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, does among them is a continuation and parallel work of Jesus himself. Although Jesus departs, his prayer is that this community have the Paraclete with them continually (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα : 14:16).

---

[136] See the references mentioned in n. 97 for a full treatment of the history and implications of these various positions.

[137] The fifth reference given often occurs in I John 2:1, but there a meaning is intended of a heavenly advocate before the Father, and that appears far afield from the gospel meaning.

---

[138] Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *A Greek Grammar*, gives 14:16 as an example of an aposition (para. 306, number 5), whereas the majority of interpreters view ἄλλος as an adjective (e.g., Bultmann, *Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 437; Barrett, *Gospel According to St. John*, p. 385; Brown, "Paraclete in John," p. 127; Strathmann, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959, p. 209.

[139] 10:16,ἄλλα πρόβατα ; 18:15, και ἄλλος μαθητής ; 20:2,3,4,8, ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής ; 20:25; 21:8,οἱ ἄλλοι μαθηταί; and 20:30,ἄλλα σημεῖα .

[140] As Bultmann has convincingly maintained: "In everything he is described as a revealer *just* as Jesus himself." He is 1) sent by God, 2) a surety not to the world but only to the faithful, 3) he takes and leads his own to the truth, 4) he does not speak from himself, 5) he denies witness for himself and convicts the world of sin (*Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 437). These factors show convincingly that the Paraclete is a parallel figure to Jesus himself.

It is of further note that in the immediate context of 14:16 the concern is expressed that Jesus will not leave the disciples as ὀρφανούς . ὄρφανος does not have here the Greek or Rabbinic connotation of disciples being left without a master;[141] rather, in the setting within the dualism of the hate of the world versus the life offered by Jesus it refers more specifically to the Old Testament understanding of an orphan as one who is at the mercy of those with power over him, as one who is cut off from the community, and as one to whom evil is done (e.g., Is. 1:17, 23; 10:2; Jer. 5:28; 7:6; Ez. 22:7). Such an understanding of this term, and the feelings associated with it, fits well within the context of the persecution of the Christian community which is the issue of the farewell discourse. The complexity of the johannine theology is eschewed, once again, in 14:18ff. Whereas the reference of v. 18 appears to be that of the parousia of Jesus, the talk of the Paraclete in v. 16 refers more readily to the period after the death of Jesus but preceding the parousia. The general context, however, suggests that the Paraclete serves in Jesus' behalf in the midst of the community, and this points to his function of serving as one who overcomes the feeling of lostness, or orphanhood, of the disciples in the world. The application of the term in 14:16 does not seem to represent an advocate, a defender in the legal sense, but rather one who stands forth as the protector of the community which is elect of God. Certainly such a picture includes the notion of one who is a comforter, as Brown has pointed out,[142] for the Paraclete aids the disciples in standing firm against persecution, and he is one in whom the disciples can be reassured that their faith is well founded.

---

[141] Cf. Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 478, n. 1.

The second Paraclete saying comes in 14:26 where the function of the Paraclete is described as teaching all things (διδάξει πάντα) and calling to remembrance all things (ὑπομνήσει πάντα) which Jesus had told the disciples. Exegesis of this saying has polarized: on the one hand there are those who contend that reference is made here only to the remembrance and understanding of what Jesus had already taught (in action and word) to his disciples, and the Paraclete merely clarifies such after Jesus' glorification.[143] At the other end of the spectrum are the exegetes who argue that here the Paraclete is functioning as a revealer in his own right and stands forth as a teacher of new truths.[144]

---

[142] Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," p. 131, n. 4, and Betz, *Der Paraklet*, p. 134, both stand firm on such a conclusion. Betz declares: "The Paraclete is the protector (*Beschützer*) of the righteous, the shield of the pious in the assault by the opponents. One needs such a one above all where one encounters the power of evil . . ." (*Der Paraklet*, p. 134).

[143] E.g., Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 485; Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 195.

[144] E.g., Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956, p. 287; W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*, p. 197.

The exegesis of the verse depends upon, for one thing, the decision whether or not the verse is to be broken. If the verse is broken after "that one will teach you all things," and the following "and bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you," then the teaching office of the Paraclete can stand on its own. If, however, "he will teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all things" is taken as one thought which is then completed by the words "which (a reference to "all things," the object of both finite verbs) I said to you," then it would appear that the Paraclete's function was that of mere recollection of what Jesus had already taught. The latter possibility would fit well with an analysis such as Wrede's for this is then an elaboration of the messianic secret concept as it runs through Mark and John.[145] Accordingly, the Paraclete would be Jesus revivendus and would obviate any consideration for the return of Jesus since that concern would already be fulfilled. The former possibility speaks more forcefully to the direction of the analysis undertaken here. This emphasis upon διδάξει as an office of the Paraclete is important for it points to a continued presence of the Holy with the community (and accords with the announcement of 14:16 concerning another Paraclete) but it also provides for the promise of Jesus' return to be future, which appears to be the intent of the pangs and tribulation of chapter 16. Joy is not now complete for the johannine community, even though they are guided by the presence of the Paraclete. Rather, joy *will be* theirs.

---

[145] See Wrede's discussion on the messianic secret and the Gospel of John, Das Messiasgeheimnis, pp. 179-206.

Added weight is given by 16:12 to the argument that the Paraclete stands as an entity apart from and detached from Jesus with an office of his own to perform. Jesus admits that he has much more to tell his disciples, but since they would not be able to bear (i.e., understand) it now there is no loss because when the Paraclete comes he will lead (ὁδηγήσει) the disciples into the truth (εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν). He will stand in the same relationship to the disciples as did Jesus, for he will reveal the things, not of his own authority, but the things which will be given him to declare from above, the things of the Father. Such a statement tends to confirm, along with 14:26, the revelatory office of the Paraclete, and, in practical terms, this suggests that the community is confirmed in its trust and faith as long as the presence of the Paraclete can be judged to be present.[146] He is the presence which confirms the

---

[146] It is not clear from the gospel what evidence could ever be presented which would indicate that the Holy Spirit was *not* present. The gospel is obviously not a philosophical tract, but an exhortatory writing and it is apparently not the place, given the immediate circumstances surrounding the writing, where doubts concerning such a lack of presence would be aired. The assurance of the Spirit is given with the existence of the community itself. Just as faith validates itself, so also the presence of the community confirms the presence of the Spirit, or Paraclete.

It seems a moot question to ask whether the Paraclete is a prophet (or, as in Betz's argument *the* prophet Michael). Certainly the teaching function of both prophet and Paraclete authenticity of the community, and his teaching is the continuing revelation which sustains that group.

Even further support to this contention is provided by 14:26. The weight of "witness" here, as Betz has argued, is to show the Paraclete as one with Jesus in 1) completing the revelation of Jesus, and 2) as the accuser of the world regarding its responsibility.[141] The Spirit of Truth speaks (witnesses) of another, not for himself, and his testimony is, therefore, true.[148]

A third distinct view of the Paraclete's function is stated in 16:8, where he is described as the one who will ἐλέγξει the world. The surrounding verses indicate that ἐλέγξει is best translated "will expose." Such an interpretation is valid because the function indicated here is not so much one of objective judgment of the world face-to-face, so to speak; but it is, rather, a function which is carried through on behalf of the elect community itself. It is not a cosmic judgment--that has already been effected by the Messiah. The world neither sees nor knows the Paraclete (14:17), but the community is the benefactor of his presence. The Paraclete will expose the world, but the exposure itself will

---

is apparent; however, the issue centers much more on the similarity of the Paraclete to Jesus and not just to the office of prophet.

[147] Betz, Der Paraklet, p. 176.

[148] Ibid., p. 177. See in this connection John 8:13 where a witness who is true does not testify concerning himself and his own words.

be to the disciples. By so doing he will be reaffirming the revelation and judgment which has already taken place through the Messiah, and he will thus be reassuring and comforting the disciples in their belief. Once again, it is the reconfirmation of faith which the Paraclete effects among the Christian community.[149]

This survey shows that there is a richness and breadth to the figure of the Paraclete which transcends any one term, such as "prophet," or "teacher," or "advocate." However, if a single term is to be appropriated that of Beistand is most appropriate. This term, signifying one who helps, assists, supports, and aids, captures the main thrust of the Paraclete speeches and their accompanying contexts.[150] The movement is toward one who stands by, or is present with, the believing community and who supports and sustains that body in their time(s) of peril. Beistand encompasses such an understanding and best sets the emphasis intended by the evangelist.

In summary, the Paraclete serves as continued confirmation of the truth of Jesus as the revealer. He represents the continuity between the time of the earthly Jesus, now departed, and the Jesus who is to return at the eschaton. In this connection, the Paraclete is the continual assurance that the faith and hope of the community are not in vain. Whereas the Paraclete speeches in and of themselves do not require a time of persecution, it should be apparent that they do fit into such an overriding concern quite cogently. The departure of the Messiah did cause a need for a theological justification of the fact by the early church, as is obvious in much of early Christian literature, and the Paraclete is John's resolution of the problem. So, the Messiah has continuity in the presence of the Paraclete. The continued present threat of death and martyrdom in the johannine community gave the flavor to the understanding of the Paraclete as one who sustains, continues to reveal the departed Messiah's message in and to the church, and supports it against the violent thrusts of Satan and his world.[151]

---

[149] The Paraclete judges the world only insofar as his presence attests to the fact of the judgment already effected by Jesus. Thus, 16:8-11 is not, properly speaking, a judgment text, but is rather one where the emphasis is on the teaching and consoling function of the Paraclete as he faces the community's shaky faith. It is an exhortatory function rather than a judgmental one. As Betz says, "The disciples need the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, as a protector against the princes of the world." (Der Paraklet, p. 208.)

[150] The notion of a comforter is certainly included in such a connotation, even though Bultmann would omit it, apparently, from his understanding of Beistand (Johannes-Evangelium, p. 439).

---

[151] A further problem concerning the Paraclete comes to light in 20:22 where Jesus bestows the Holy Spirit on the assembled disciples. There are at least two problems with this bestowal: 1) the Paraclete, or Holy Spirit (identified together in 14:26), was not to come to the disciples until Jesus had ascended, i.e., departed from them. This prerequisite is falsified by 20:22, for 20:17 states that Jesus had not yet ascended (ἀναβέβηκα) to the Father; so these appearances were prior to his ascention; 2) all of the Paraclete sayings make clear that, given the presupposition Jesus would have departed from the disciples, the Paraclete would be sent (πέμπω) to them and not given directly by Jesus as is bluntly stated here. Certainly the Paraclete sayings differ as to who will actually send the Paraclete: 14:16, the Father will give (send) him; 14:26, the Father will send him;

D. Summary of the Chapter

The arguments of this chapter have sought to demonstrate that the setting and provocation for the writing of the Fourth Gospel was two-fold: 1) the persecution by the Jewish community which was a response to the implicit threat contained within nascent Christianity, and 2) the continued absence of the Lord of the church which issued in a crisis of faith, and this resulted in the need for assurances that the Christian faith was well founded in the Messiah Jesus, that such a departure was forecast by Jesus and is therefore part of the salvation history, and that the Spirit continues to guide and is present in the community.

The manner of theological argument created by John is manifestly joined to this crisis situation. His arguments are aimed at overcoming the pessimism and panic of the community by affirming the implicit joy and hope given with Jesus' departure from the earthly scene. Further, that joy is also to be sensed in the threat of death for themselves, which is evidence that they are the elect of God and will not be left as orphans by him. Thus, even though the outward

---

15:26, Jesus will send him from the father; 16:7, Jesus will send him. Even though these promises are not in total concert, there is no suggestion that Jesus would give the Holy Spirit to the disciples in person. 20:22 is an attempt to show that the disciples did receive and are the bearers of the Holy Spirit. Chapter 20, as well as 18 and 19, contain many incidents which are more traditional (i.e., more "synoptic-like") in nature and they have been combined here, likely, without strict regard for the argument advanced in the farewell discourse.

argument of the farewell discourse is one which elicits joy and confidence, it must be observed that, underlying such a presentation is the threat of annihilation to the readers. The farewell discourse calls for steadfastness to the end. Because of the direction taken in this discourse, and the threats to life which underlie it, it may be concluded that, indeed, John exhibits a *theologia crucis* as potent as any in the New Testament.[152] The outward *theologia gloriae* is the fostered goal of the evangelist, but it is still exhortation to the community which must face the issue of its own death squarely. Thus, the issue of the farewell discourse is the *theologia crucis*, John's response to the community which must face its own cross.

The evangelist presents such a theology in response to the immediate situation facing the community. With such a Sitz-im-Leben in view, the specific nature and content of the johannine ethic can be reconstructed.

---

[152] Käsemann contends that the primary difference of John and Paul is the fact that John lacks a *theologia crucis* and has only a *theologia gloriae* in its place. This distorts, however, the implicit *theologia crucis* which is at the heart of the farewell discourse. In this attack on Käsemann's position Bornkamm is in agreement ("Zur Interpretation des Johannesevangeliums," *EvTh* 28, number 1, (January, 1968), p. 18).

CHAPTER III

THE ETHIC OF THE EVANGELIST

A. Expectations of an Ethic Directed to a Persecution Situation

The farewell discourse discloses a situation in which Christians faced persecution. In view of the function of the farewell discourse literary form, it is not presumptuous to suppose that the evangelist used it to help the community in that situation. Specifically, the exhortations in the discourse relate to the persecution context and are conceived to provide ethical guidance which is not mere inference from dogmatic positions. To substantiate this claim is the aim of the present chapter.

Before calculating the evidence, it is helpful to anticipate what might be expected in such a persecution ethic. A most helpful study in this respect is Riddle's book, The Martyrs.[1] This is still an informative book, in spite of its age, because it seeks to look at the questions precipitating the adulation of the martyrs and to see why the martyrs responded as they did. Riddle's socio-historical approach is helpful since he demonstrates thereby the characteristic means of control by which Christians were aided through their harrowing persecution experiences. Because Riddle is concerned to show the type of action which was expected of Christians in such times, a summary of his conclusions can serve as a springboard to the analysis of the johannine ethic.

---

[1] Cf. n. 107 in chapter 2. This work attempts to raise the questions which stood behind the martyrologies and the pronouncements of the church to encourage the martyred. Third and fourth century documents form the basis of the study, but in the last chapters Riddle discusses the relationship between those documents and several of the books of the New Testament canon.

Riddle argues that the basic element in the control of adherents was the force of the value of unity. A united stance was essential for the preservation of the movement itself;[2] consequently, uniformity of behavior was desired. Accordingly, rewards were promised for steadfastness during persecution and punishments were threatened if one did not fulfill his obligation during such times. Rewards included immortality, a revered distinction in the community, and even special place and privilege before God. Punishments, on the other hand, centered in the exclusion from the group which had, as well, eternal consequences. To give courage to the persecuted, or those in danger of persecution, exhortations of comfort as well as of threat and promise were issued by those in authority within the Christian groups.[3]

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 25, 52ff. Riddle summarizes his contention:

> The process was essentially as follows: to secure from its adherents the behavior which was necessary if the movement were to survive, rewards of a sufficiently compelling nature were held forth, so that in the person being examined, or likely to be examined, there would be generated a wish to maintain his present relation. . . . Encouragement was given by the thought of the participation of others in similar experiences, and it was pointed out that failure or success would be witnessed by one's fellows. In specific detail proper attitudes were suggested, stock answers to the prospective questions were taught, and stereotyped arguments were supplied, together with persuasive evaluations and heroic imagery.

At the heart of these exhortations lay the examples of fellow Christians who were already martyred. And, at the head of the list stood Christ himself who was the protomartyr.[4] Such examples disclosed continuity with others in the faith who were already noteworthy for their steadfastness in face of adversity. Christ was important in this regard because he was total master of the situation which he faced. The opponent did not have any control over him; rather, he had control and went to his death willingly. By such action, Christ showed that he was already victorious. The passion story itself appears to stand as an example of this emphasis and was utilized accordingly by the writers of the later martyrologies.[5] Such exhortation sought to provide the

---

[3] Ibid., pp. 87ff. Those in authority included both persons living, such as bishops, but also the authoratative records of the writings including both the scriptures of the Jews as well as those of the early Christians and apostles.

[4] Ibid., pp. 87-88.

[5] A point raised as well by Hans Surkau, Martyrien, p. 135. The Gospel of John seems to stand, in the line of development, somewhere in the transition from Jewish apocalyptic testaments and the rise of Christian martyrologies. Indeed, the basic composition of a martyrology is quite similar--likely dependent--to that of the gospels, especially John. Riddle outlines the martyrology as follows:

> They were written ostensibly as reports of the confessor's examination and the martyr's death. Sometimes the story of the court proceedings is prefaced by the relation of events leading up to it, the rise of the action which led to the martyr's arrest, some account of his earlier life, and an account of his behavior immediately before the final events. But the essential features are

persecuted with a dramatic representation of a gloriously accomplished victory in the ones who had gone before.[6] "It was a proper insight which recommended candidates to 'think less of death than immortality.'"[7] The victory was already theirs, if they could act properly.

At the base of such exhortations stands the conviction that the Christian community was engaged in a struggle with Satan himself; the battle, therefore, is approached as a cosmological one. Those who persecute the Christians are mere instruments of the power of Satan.[8] Success for the Christian in the face of this comes from faithfulness to the community--standing with and in behalf of the brother; this fidelity is in itself a visible defeat of Satan.

---

those which describe the activity of the witness during and after the examination. Usually the dialogue between the judge and the witness is graphically reported in considerable detail. The martyr's fortitude, his bearing while he was being examined, and his dignity under abuse are all pictured with more or less verisimilitude. Not infrequently the ancient world view is patently reflected in the description of supernatural portents which are alleged to have occurred (109).

[6] Ibid., p. 53.

[7] Ibid., p. 59. Cyprian's comment is here quite applicable where he talks of the martyrs' glorious immortalities, not deaths. Quoted by Riddle, p. 36. Such a description shows the similarities between the gospel accounts and those of the martyrologies. John's role in the development of early Christian martyrological literature still needs to be examined further.

[8] The letter from Lyons and Vienne describing the persecution there in 177 A.D. talks not against the political magistrates but against Satan who is acting through such individuals. See Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History, with English trans. by Kirsopp Lake, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965, V. 1ff.

Such a summary demonstrates the flavor and intent of the persecution and martyrological literature of the third and fourth centuries.

An analysis of the johannine exhortations in the farewell discourse shows how similar are the methods of that evangelist and those Christian authorities who came later on the scene in Christian history, and that similarity, it will be shown, gives support to the conclusion that the johannine ethic is a persecution ethic. The gap in time, be it noted, is not crucial since the problem of influences or development is not at issue. The analogous functions and analogous structures are the striking points for consideration.

B. Stylistic Characteristics of the Johannine Exhortations

The exhortations pertinent to this study of John contain several stylistic characteristics. These features, when viewed in relation to their contexts, help to form a Gestalt of the johannine ethical exhortation. And, by the isolation of the stylistic traits, the themes are allowed to emerge which play an essential role in the johannine ethic.

Five prominent stylistic features have been isolated which help to delineate the content of the johannine ethic: (1) the exhortatory (imperatival) use of ἵνα , (2) the exhortatory use of the conditional sentence with ἐάν plus the subjunctive, (3) the exhortatory use of the participle, (4) the exhortatory use of the imperative, and (5) the exhortatory use of the epexegetical ἵνα . These features can be considered in the contexts of three pericopae: 13:31-38; 14:15-24, and 15:7-17.

1. 13:31-38, especially verses 34 and 35. This introductory section, in which the specific themes to be elaborated in the discourse are presented, has two emphases: the betrayal of Jesus by Judas and the accompanying glorification and the prediction of Peter's betrayal. The first theme is of concern here, especially verses 34 and 35: the departure of Jesus calls for a cohesiveness of the community. Jesus is departing but the community is given a commandment to live by. The structure of verse 34 is noteworthy.

13:34 ἐντολὴν ϰαινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν (a)
ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους (b)
ϰαθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς (a)
ἵνα ϰαὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους (b)

The characteristic of the johannine exhortatory style of importance here is (1) the use of the imperatival ἵνα . The ἵνα clause functions much as a main sentence; it stands by itself. In post-classical Greek, one of the uses of ἵνα was to provide an alternative to the imperative mood for the expression of "requests, exhortations, and injunctions."[9] In the farewell discourse, John utilizes this form with the second person plural (see also 15:12, 17).

Also, the adverbial clause introduced by ϰαθώς is used in such contexts (cf. 15:9, 10, 12) with the johannine hierarchical model of greater to lesser. The comparison introduced by καθώς refers always to the action of the higher figure of Jesus or the Father and the comparison presents exemplary expressions of the actions exhorted to the listeners. In 13:34 the καθώς sentence states the sanction behind the command: Jesus has loved his own; therefore, those in the community ought to love their fellows as Jesus had loved them.

---

[9] C. F. Cadoux, "The Imperatival Use of ἵνα in the New Testament," JTS 42 (1941), p. 165.

13:35 ἐν τούτῳ γνώσονται πάντες (a)
ὅτι ἐμοὶ μαθηταί ἐστε
ἐὰν ἀγάπαν ἔχητε ἐν ἀλλήλους (b)

The structure of this verse is bound to that of verse 34:

13:34	(a) Jesus commands	(b) commandment of love given
	(a) Jesus loved	(b) disciples are to love
13:35	(a) Discipleship to Jesus	(b) rests on condition of love

Verse 35 demonstrates (2) the conditional sentence beginning with ἐάν plus the subjunctive. This is used to explicate or, it might be said, to guide or influence a style of action. As 13:35 says, discipleship is authentic only as it is expressed in love for the brother. Accordingly, the exhortation is a completion of 13:34 (cf. 14:15, 23; 15:4, 6, 7, 10, 14).

2. 14:15-24, with special attention to verses 15, 21, and 23. This section (a) sets forth the conditions for receiving the Paraclete, (b) gives assurance that the disciples will not be left as orphans, (c) concludes that doing Jesus' commands is a prerequisite for Jesus' disclosure, and (d) creates a dialogue with Judas to underscore the qualifications of disclosure. The exhortations central to (c) and

(d) both form conclusions to their respective parts.

14:15 ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με
τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε

A conditional clause opens this new section and is similar in style to 13:35, although here the condition precedes the indicative. The conditional clause is completed by the exhortation to keep the commandments. So, loving Jesus means keeping his commandments. This is the broader condition upon which the coming of the Paraclete depends.

14:21 ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτάς (a)
ἐκεῖνος ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με. (b)
ὁ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με ἀγαπηθήσεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός (a)
κἀγω ἀγαπήσω αὐτὸν [μου (b)
καὶ ἐμφανίσω αὐτῶ ἐμαυτόν

This verse expands the initial exhortation of verse 15. He who loves will be loved by the Father and Jesus and to him will Jesus' disclosure be made. The second part builds upon the first: the loving one will be loved by the Father and Jesus. What is of note stylistically is point (3), the use of the participle as an imperative (cf. 14:23; 15:5; 14:12). Daube contends that this usage developed from the hebraic participial use.[10] Since the participial form expresses a continued action (e.g., ἀγαπῶν = the one loving, which suggests continued, not static action), such an expression of ". . . a custom may be very much the same as to convey the proper line of conduct."[11] Its use is not extended to an absolute, unquestioned, or unquestionable law, but appeals to the conscience of the addressee.[12] In the case of 14:21, the one having the commandments and keeping them is the one who loves Jesus. The reader is, thereby, exhorted to keep those commandments.

---

[10] D. Daube, "Participle and Imperative in I Peter," in E. Selwyn, _The First Epistle of St. Peter_, London: Macmillan and Co., 1952, pp. 467-488.

[11] _Ibid_., p. 471.

14:23 ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με (a)
τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει (b)
καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτόν (a)
καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα (b)
καὶ μονὴν παρ᾽ αὐτῶ ποιησόμεθα
ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ (a)

This verse is a conclusion to the interjected dialogue for further intensification of the exhortation of verse 21 and parallels that verse. Whereas the participial imperative was used in verse 21, here the conditional clause introduces the same point. The verse ends with a negative participial imperative which concludes the section in a vivid, but blunt, manner.

3. 15:7-17, v. 7 ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν ἐμοὶ (a)
καὶ τὰ ῥῆματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ (a^1)
ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν. (b)

v. 8 ἐν τούτω ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου (a)
ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε (b)
καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί.

v. 9 καθὼς ἠγάπησέν με ὁ πατήρ (a)
κἀγὼ ὑμᾶς ἠγάπησα (b)
μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ (a)

v. 10 ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσητε (a)
μενεῖτε ἐν τῆ ἀγαπῄ μου (b)
καθὼς ἐγὼ τοῦ πατρός μου τὰς ἐντολὰς τετήρηκα (a)
καὶ μένω αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. (b)

---

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 475.

v. 12 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ ἐμή (a)
ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους (b)
καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς

v. 13 μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει (a)
ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ (b)
ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ

v. 14 ὑμεῖς φίλοι μου ἐστε (a)
ἐὰν ποιῆτε ὁ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν. (b)

v. 17 ταῦτα ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν (a)
ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους. (b)

The structure of this section is tied to the metaphor of the vine in verses 1-6 and the exhortations of verses 7-17 are built upon that metaphor. Significantly, verse 17 concludes the section with the command which began the discourse in 13:34.

Additional stylistic characteristics are found in this material. In relation to the outline at the beginning of the section, point (4) is the use of the imperative itself for exhortatory purposes in 15:9 (cf. 15:4). In verse 9 it completes the thought of verse 7 and the appeal to remain in Jesus, which is to remain in Jesus' love. Further, it provides for the reintroduction (cf. 14:21, 23) of the appeal to keep the commandments (v. 10). In 15:7ff. the infinitive appears in conjunction with the conditional sentence, the imperatival use of ἵνα, and also point (5) the epexegetical use of ἵνα in verse 8 and 13. The epexegetical use of ἵνα explicates the main clause and, in turn, the ἵνα introduces the ethical content of the sentences. The emphasis of the evangelist continues the appeal to fulfill the intention of the saying and does not suggest that the hearers have already done so. If John were stating something which was already a fact he would most likely have employed ὅτι rather than ἵνα.[13]

These passages show the range of John's exhortatory expressions and demonstrate their interrelatedness. With such stylistic features in mind, it is appropriate to turn to the content of the exhortations themselves and to deal with the themes which emerge from them.

C. Thematic Considerations in the Johannine Exhortations

The themes of John's exhortation are pivotal for the interpretation of John's ethic. They provide the specific content which gives concretion to the structural intention of the farewell discourse. An analysis of the themes in isolation provides confirming evidence that the structure of the discourse, as discussed in Chapter 2, is intended to give guidance to a community faced with persecution. The ensuing investigation will analyze the role played by the following themes: (1) keeping the commandments, (2) loving one another, (3) bearing fruit, (4) remaining in Jesus, and (5) remaining faithful. These themes focus on membership within the community of faith and they serve to elucidate the johannine ethic. It is important to approach these items remembering that they all have their place within the lengthy passion account of John's gospel and they are all used by Jesus as he prepared to depart from his disciples.

---

[13] Blass-Debrunner-Funk, Greek Grammar, p. 202, para. 394.

Keeping the Commandments

The first theme which helps to specify the johannine ethic is that of keeping the commandments: τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε . Related to ἐντολή are the terms ἐντέλλομαι , λόγος , and ῥῆμα , all of which serve to elucidate one another, even though it is too much to say they are interchangeable. The texts of primary significance for this inquiry include: ἐντολή and ἐντέλλομαι : 13:34; 14:15, 21, 23; 15:5, 9, 12, 17; 13:13; λόγος : 5:38; 8:31, 51; 12:48 (even though these references do not appear in the farewell discourse they are important in establishing the interrelatedness and differences among the terms); and ῥῆμα : 12:47, 48; 15:7.

Commandment (ἐντολή) in John is utilized to express the revelation of God through Jesus.[14] Any thought of commandment as a precept to be obeyed is clearly secondary to the revelation which is at the heart of the term.[15] In John

---

[14] An exception to this general phenomenon is 11:57 where ἐντολάς clearly refers to orders and precepts to be dutifully carried out.

[15] Spicq is correct in noting that John's pattern here is parallel to the Old Testament understanding of torah as first of all divine will, i.e., revelation, and only derivatively to be viewed as a legal precept (C. Spicq, Agape in the New Testament, Vol. 3, trans. by Marie Aquinas McNamare and Mary Honoria Richter, St. Louis: B. Herder, 1966, p. 48). Gutbrod also concurs in this judgment when he says

12:49-50 Jesus says: "For I have not spoken on my own authority; the Father who sent me has himself given me ἐντολήν concerning what I should say and what I should speak. And I know his ἐντολή is eternal life." John 10:17f. further illustrates the revelatory character of the divine command; the setting is the shepherd giving his life for his sheep. Jesus relates that the Father loves him because he gives his life for his sheep *willingly* and by his own authority. No one takes it from him. This is a command to voluntary death, a dialectical relationship to be sure: that which is commanded is yet viewed as voluntary. Such exhortation is presented in order to give, at the same time, a note of encouragement that the one following God's command is he who is already victorious. Later martyrs were encouraged by exhortations which showed the persecuted, if faithful, to be a part of the noble company of God.[16] "The martyr is pictured always as master of the situation in which he is placed. . . . He is never carried to an unwelcome fate by untoward circumstances, but always is pictured as laying down his life of himself."[17]

---

that in John there is never a concern for the validity of the law, but rather it is a type of revelation and, as such, is set over against the Jews ("νόμος," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. 4, ed. by G. Kittel, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942, pp. 1075-1076 (Hereafter this work is cited as *TWNT*, or *TDNT* for English volumes where applicable). Of the commandment in the history of Israel, O'Connell says that "It is the communication to Israel of a complete mode of life, whose foundation--the love of God--lies too deep to be adequately comprehended in terms of positive law" (The Concept of Commandment in the Old Testament," *TS* 21 (1960), p. 383).

[16] Riddle, *The Martyrs*, p. 120.

[17] *Ibid*.

The commandment of John is such as exhortation to willful action. One should be willing to give his life on behalf of his brothers. Dying is not efficacious in itself, but the worthy death is that in which one has been faithful and steadfast to his friends (15:13). The commandment in John is a call for mutual support in the presence of hostility from without. The situation addressed in the structure of the farewell discourse gives concretion to the command. The command is revelatory in that it is grounded both in the words of Jesus and in his death and glorification.

A revelatory function of commandment is reflected also in John's juxtaposition of the terms ἐντολή - νόμος. Every occurrence of νόμος [18] refers to the torah of the Jews. In addition, every mention of the Jews' torah is counterbalanced or completed by reference to the person of Jesus. Jesus does not break the Jewish law, but every time he completes it, or is at least faithful to it. The relation of torah to Jesus is given already in 1:17 which concisely announces: the law was given through Moses, grace and truth come through Jesus Christ. This connection supports the contention that, for John, the Jewish torah is not a negative force, after the fashion of a Marcionite exegesis, for example. The revelation of Jesus fulfills and completes the Jewish torah and that is to say that the torah has been superseded in Jesus.[19] The revelation of the Mosaic law (1:17) is consumated in the grace and truth given in Jesus and his commandment.

---

[18] John 1:17, 45; 7:19, 23, 49, 51: 8:17; 18:31; and three times it is found in quotations from the Old Testament Psalms: 10:34; 12:34; and 15:25.

Because of the revelatory intent of ἐντολή in John, it follows that there is no conceptual difference between the use of the singular commandment and the plural commandments. The revelatory function of the terms makes the interchange of these terms fully acceptable. This has been a problem of concern for commentators; however, those who contend that there is a significant difference in the use of the singular and the plural argue unconvincingly. Lazure, for example, contends that the distinction lies between the entire will of God as expressed by the plural form whereas the singular form makes precise a specific aspect of that will.[20] Prunet argues, in reverse fashion, that the commandments do not mean a return to legalism but express "the effulgence of the unique commandment in the diversity of the obedient life."[21] For Lazure the plural expresses the whole will of God, whereas for Prunet it is the singular which holds the essence of the godly will. In addition to such confusion, such distinctions do not find corraborative support in the texts where, in fact, the commandment which Jesus gives his disciples is one only and no more: "My commandment is this, that you love one another as I have loved you (13:34; 15:12)." Bultmann rightly observes the interchangeableness of these two forms when he says, "As the father's ἐντολαί to Jesus (15:10) are in reality one (12:49b), so he (Jesus) speaks sometimes of his ἐντολαί (15:10; 14:15, 21), and sometimes of his ἐντολή (13:34; 15:12)."[22] Materially considered, both forms point to the disclosure of Jesus to the community.[23]

---

[19] See, e.g., Lazure, Les valeurs morales, p. 124.

[20] Ibid., p. 127.

[21] Prunet, La morale chrétienne, p. 26; see also G. Schrenk, " ἐντέλλομαι , ἐντολή ," TWNT, Vol. 2, p. 550.

This general discussion of ἐντολή is supported further by the expression ἐντολὴν καινήν . "A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another just as I have loved you (13:34)." The subject of agape will be analyzed later, but a consideration of the *new*ness represented here will help to ascertain the intent of the commandment language.

No consensus has been reached by commentators as to the meaning of "a new commandment." The suggestions vary from those who argue that it is a new command because it is not contained in the Hebrew decalog,[24] to the view that it is new because of its christological foundations.[25] The first suggestion is too pedantic to hold real validity, for indeed love was commanded of the people of Israel (see Lev. 19:18). The second broadly conceived alternative is the obvious connotation assumed by the gospel writer, and such is expressed with a specific meaning in mind. The boldness of the expression "new commandment" is directed to the newly founded community and is covenantal in nature. Such a meaning is suggested by Schweizer when he says that what is new is the koinonia of the people with the son.[26] It is clear from John's gospel account that the community addressed in the farewell discourse is the elect community (15:16, 19; 13:18; and the referent of the true vine in chapter 15) and is the true people of God.[27] Even if Loisy goes too far in saying that the new commandment given here is *identical* to the new covenant of I Corinthians 11:25,[28] he is correct in so far as the new command points to the new community precipitated by Jesus. That this is a covenant community, even though John never uses διαθήκη , can be surmised from several observations. First, the setting itself shows this: the farewell discourse of the dying leader, the last meal and footwashing scene (13:1ff.), the accentuation of love to one's fellows (13:34f.), the dualism which sets the elect community apart from the world.[29] Further, the metaphors of the vine and the shepherd, as Böcher concludes, are tied to and proceed from the *Bundestheologie* of the folk Israel and they have carry-over value for John's community where otherwise the classical terms of the self-designation of the Christian community are missing.[30] Also, the gospel is predicated upon an understanding of salvation history, even though this is not explicitly developed. God has sent his son into the world to save his own. Yet, this gnostic motif is expressed in terms of the Jewish understanding of the Messiah. Jesus is the fulfillment of the Jewish torah,[31] while at the same time the one who supersedes it. The new commandment is comprehensible because it is put in language which has its roots in the salvation history of the Jews and the apocalyptic hopes of the intertestamental Jewish religion. John's antagonism toward the Jews as a body is not directed to their poorer traditions and foundations but to their present refusal to see in Jesus and his community the fulfillment of their own traditions.

---

[22] Bultmann, *Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 416. Hoskyns also makes the same point in *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 417.

[23] It is an intriguing question whether or not John is related to Deuteronomy in this matter. In Deuteronomy one finds also ἐντολή and ἐντολαί used interchangeably quite often (e.g., 6:1, 2, 17, 25; 7:9, 11; 8:1, 2). For Deuteronomy as for John it would be quite tenuous to argue that the singular and plural forms are really different materially.

[24] Weiss, *Das Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 466; Loisy, *Le quatrième Évangile*, p. 401. Loisy does, however, go on to explicate the expression further according to the second alternative mentioned.

---

[25] A position represented by such men as Bultmann and Dibelius who see the newness in the Wesensprädikat (Johannes-Evangelium, p. 405; and "Joh. 15:13," p. 179). Prunet sees the newness in the close of one age and the new creation of men through Christ (La morale chrétienne, p. 104); and Barrett sees the new quality not as an edifying love of disciples for one another but new in that the Father and Son are revealed in that way (Gospel According to St. John, p. 377).

[26] E. Schweizer, "Geist und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament und heute," ThEh, N. F., 32 (1952), p. 28.

[27] For John it would be improper to use the term "true Israel," even though it could be demonstrated that such a term corresponded to his meaning. Israel is Judaism whereas the Christian community in John is the successor to that community. There is no serious attempt by John to connect the Christian church with what Israel should have been or was at its inception. On the contrary, the unavoidable dichotomy is between the Christian community and covenant with that of the Jewish community and covenant. There is no negative statement as such against the Jewish covenant; it has merely been superseded.

---

[28] Loisy, *Le quatrième Évangile*, p. 401.

[29] These emphases come to expression in the Dead Sea Scrolls also. Persecuted from without, the Qumran community drew tightly to themselves. Naturally, since the number of writings from Qumran are so diverse, many examples come forward which go beyond John in the development of the covenantal nature of the community. However, their very separation, like John, called attention to their contention that they were the true people of God and the faithful adherents to his torah. Revelation for both the johannine and Qumran communities came from a special source: Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness, and both communities rest upon the traditions of the Hebrews for their comprehension of what faithfulness means. Cf. G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1962, especially the introduction.

[30] O. Böcher, *Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965, pp. 128-129.

John uses the new commandment to exhort the distressed Christian group to renewed recognition and remembrance of who it is. In this regard, it is significant in what it relates about the one who gives this new command. The relationship which John limns here is exemplary of his use of theological reflection in the farewell address and that is expressed as follows: just as the Father gave a command to Jesus (12:49,

---

[31] See, for example, those places in John where the Old Testament is seen as something to be fulfilled: 12:38; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24, 28, 36. Other places show that the Old Testament was a place in which one could look for suitable quotes: 1:23; 2:17; 6:31, 45; 7:38, 42; 8:17; 10:34; 12:15, 16. See the article by A. Faure, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungs-hypothese," ZNW 21 (1922), pp. 99-121, where these passages are related to the construction of John's gospel.

Concerning the lack of a salvation history in John, see Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 2, pp. 8-9, where he denies that any such understanding of history is in the gospel.

50; 14:31; 15:10), so Jesus gives a command to his disciples (13:34; 15:12). The covenant relationship of the johannine community is cast in a hierarchical drama. The Father commands the Son; the Son fulfills the command in reproducing it in word and deed to his disciples; and the implications for the disciples' response are carried in that revelation of Jesus. No one has ever seen God (1:18) but the Son reveals him in the Son's word and deed. This is the claim of the evangelist which is incapable of proof apart from the faith of the community. And, just as the Son revealed the invisible Father, so now the community reveals the invisible, glorified Son. Thus, within the hierarchical drama, the remaining community, whose Lord has departed, must now understand itself as the keeper of that word. Jesus gave the word to his own, so now the community must keep that word and be faithful to it.

But how is the commandment to be conceived? Is it a very general, and assuredly vague, term in the farewell discourse, or is it specific in content? Prunet has argued: "The essential thing (about the commandment) was the christological foundation of a Christian action, and every (any) specification of that action would be superfluous."[32] However, does not the very supposed lack of specific precepts in these chapters point in the direction of a solution to the enigma of the exhortation to "keep my commandments"? If one concludes that the plural and singular forms are no different materially, then the specificity of the commandment is ready at hand: "This is my command that you love one another as I have loved you (15:12; 13:34)." The command shows the mandatory significance of Jesus for the community. His word stands behind the legitimation of the community's response to the situation and demands a response like that of Jesus. The discussion to follow will demonstrate that the command to love one another has a specific reference and is not a broad and universal term. The situation of the community lies behind the disciples' appropriation of Jesus' command.

---

[32] Prunet, La morale chrétienne, p. 26. Lazure makes the same claim when he says that the commandments remain "open to a series of actions implied in their observance, whether that of love, of belief, of adoring the father, of praying in the name of the son, or of marching in the truth (Les valeurs morales, p. 143)." Since they are universal commands they apply to an infinite number of acts.

A note needs to be included concerning the relationship between ἐντολή and λόγος (and ῥῆμα).[33] The evangelist's use of these terms suggests that they are interchangeable. Ῥῆμα , it is interesting to note, appears every time in the plural (e.g., 3:34; 6:63, 68; 15:7), whereas λόγος is used most often in the singular (e.g., 12:48; 14:23, 24; 15:3, 20). Materially these terms are bound closely together and should not be ascribed different meanings. As 12:48

---

[33] Bultmann has argued that these words, λόγος and ῥῆμα , are interchangeable (Johannes-Evangelium, p. 414, n. 3 in reference to 15:7, and p. 227, n. 5 with reference to 8:55, and p. 416 with reference to 15:10). Dodd contends that λόγοι and ῥήματα are interchangeable and merely refer to words spoken by Jesus, whereas λόγος (sing.) is used in the sense of a saying, statement, or discourse, and a λόγος is composed of λόγοι or ῥήματα (The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 265).

shows, the two terms are intimately connected: "The one . . . not receiving my words (ῥῆματα) has his judgment; the word (λόγος) which I spoke judges him . . ." 3:34 says that "the one sent by God speaks his words (ῥῆματα) and in 17:14 Jesus says: "I gave them your word (λόγον)." 15:7 and 15:38 speak of the word remaining in the people, 15:7 using the plural ῥῆματα and 15:38 using the singular λόγον . The preference of John for the singular λόγος likely has its roots in the "word of God" expression of the Hebraic tradition: דבר-יהות.

Just as it is clear that there is a correlation between these two johannine terms, so also there is such a close correspondence between λόγος and ἐντολή . In 14:23 Jesus exhorts: "if someone loves me he will keep my λόγον ." 14:15 correspondingly relates: "if you love me you will keep my ἐντολάς ." And 14:21 says: "he who has my ἐντολάς and keeps them, that one is the one who loves me." The correspondence is close; however, it is not so certain that these two terms (or three if ῥῆμα is brought into the discussion with λόγος) are interchangeable. It appears that commandment is the more restricted term and is specified in the farewell discourse more sharply than is "word." Commandment is included in the broad use of "word" in John and points to the comprehension of what "word" means, but the term "commandment" relates the explicit exhortation in the farewell discourse which is not given necessarily with "word." The commandment makes specific in calling for love for one another, whereas the use of λόγος varies much more throughout the gospel and tends to encompass the entire revelatory gift in Jesus.[34]

ἐντολή gives concretion to λόγος in the farewell discourse and is itself revelatory. Through the commandment the community is led to the understanding of the will of Jesus. The commandment is not a precept to be followed dutifully, but it is a word which opens up the covenantal relationship between man and God through the means of the community of faith. The remembered tradition, including the words of Jesus and the scriptures of the Jews, forms the basis of the word which the community possesses, but only as the relation of faithfulness continues within the community does revelation continue. In the setting of the farewell discourse, the community must boldly confront the absence of its savior. The evangelist adeptly portrays the pattern of the salvation history: Jesus reveals the unseen God, and now the community must reveal the unseen Lord. To keep the commandments is thus to participate in the relationships initiated by and taught by the Lord. The question of the johannine ethic rests not on a new legalism but rather on a revelation of what life is and how the way (14:6) is to be understood and followed.

Loving One Another

A satisfactory interpretation of John's use of agape depends on the recognition that this is a restrictive term.

---

[34] See the discussion in Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 263ff.

The conundrum posed by this term, with its supposed lack of specificity as to what constitutes love, is overcome when it is recognized that agape does not appear in isolation but is completed and elucidated by "one-another:"ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους (13:34, 35; 15:12, 17). Such love is directed to those, solely those, who stand within the covenant relationship. Just as Jesus directed his love to τοῦς ἰδίους (13:1), so also are those who are a part of the covenant relationship with Jesus to direct their love τοῦς ἀλλήλους . Such a restriction is always present. Even in 11:5 where mention is made of Jesus' love for Martha it is apparent that by her belief Martha demonstrates her participation in the elect community. "One's own" (ἰδίους--ἀλλήλους) is used in John's dualistic cosmology to identify the scions of Jesus as well as the scions of the world. 15:19 points to the latter relationship when it says: "If you were of the world, the world would love its own." ἴδιος in John makes explicit which sphere a person belongs to, whether to that of the world and Satan, or whether to that of Jesus and his covenant. When the term is used in connection with the covenant group it refers always to the Father's love for those who keep the commandments. The one exception to this generalization is 3:16 where reference is made to the Father's love for the world. Käsemann's judgment is correct that since this is the only occurrence of such a proposal in the gospel it should not be considered as normative for johannine thought.[35] Such a judgment is a propos for the farewell discourse where there is no such concern of love for the cosmos, but instead there appears a hostile dichotomy between those elect of God and those of the world.

Since John builds upon an expressed dichotomy between the elect community and the cosmic forces and powers, it is important to understand the essential role played by the restricted love commandment in the gospel. Käsemann's analysis is correct when he speaks concerning the dualism of community --world: "Nothing speaks for the love of the brother as an example for the love of neighbor. On the contrary, there is a definite shrinking taking place (as opposed to the rest of the New Testament), as is also found in the Qumran community."[36] Bowen is caustically succinct in pointing to the direction of the johannine agape, but he does recognize the importance of John's dualism when he argues that John's dualism is most vicious when he talks of agape: "He draws a circle that shuts most out, and his agape is a mutual relationship among those within. The Synoptic Christ seeks the outcasts, John's saves those in the inner circle. He (John) is not profoundly loving at all."[37] All of the evidence which can be compended from the gospel points to the intended restriction of the love commandment to those within the inner circle.

---

[35] Käsemann, Jesu letzter Wille, p. 17. 3:16ff. and 3:31ff. do not contradict this attestation. Although Jesus was sent because "God loved the world," yet, "men preferred darkness to light because their deeds were evil. . ." Only he who does the truth responds to Jesus and these are "his own." The others do not partake of Jesus' revelation and are outside of consideration

A love restricted to the Christian community was given as a proper exegesis of John by J. Moffatt in Love in the New Testament, New York: Richard R. Smith, in 1930. Nygren made this same observation in Agape and Eros in 1932 (English trans. by Philip S. Watson, London: S. P. C. K., 1953, p. 153ff.). In 1933 W. Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium, pp. 177, 192, concluded the same. Ratschow's conclusions, formulated in 1950, were not new but he developed the thesis with solid historical support as part of the development of early Christianity.

[36] Käsemann, Jesu letzter Wille, pp. 106-107. Käsemann is overstepping the case when he contends that this type of shrinking is lacking in the rest of the New Testament, e.g., Revelation and I Peter certainly include such an understanding, and it is possible that even Paul is a forerunner of

The agape relationship in the Fourth Gospel is a restrictive, but ethical term. Such a conclusion must still give account of the continuing debate which has ensued among exegetes as to whether ἀγάπη in John is a term restricted to the Christian community or a term whose referent is the community but the intention of which encompasses a humanistic, and hence universal, range. The latter position has its articulate defenders. Westcott emphatically declares: "The love is universal in its scope, and universal also in its

---

John in this respect (see Ratschow's discussion of this, pp. 174-175). Furthermore, Montefiore and Stauffer both argue that since love in Paul is the fundamental principle of ecclesiastical life, therefore he is indeed a forerunner of John in identifying love with the Christian body. See Montefiore, "Thou Shalt Love the Neighbour as Thyself," NT 5 (1962), p. 170, where he gives his own conclusions and quotes Stauffer to this effect.

[37] C. R. Bowen, "Love in the Fourth Gospel," JR 13 (1933), p. 42. Other commentators are not so vindictive as is Bowen, but they still recognize the importance of the restrictive clause in John, e.g., Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium, p. 177, and Moffatt, Love in the New Testament, pp. 281-308.

application. It belongs to common life."[38] Via argues against any exclusivism by affirming that the total context of the gospel indicates that such agape is all-encompassing: "Certainly the implication of the total johannine context is that this love is directed toward all."[39] And in a similar vein, Prunet contends that the lack of love in John directed to those outside the community is only an appearance, and, since we "should exegete John in a positive manner" it is clear that there is no restrictive connotation of love in John![40]

The issue is compounded by those interpreters who confuse the meanings of "brother love" and "neighbor love" by combining them. The synoptic gospels make it clear what the love of neighbor entails, and they even specify who the neighbor is. The parable of the good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) is an example of this. In that parable the neighbor is understood as someone apart from the community of faith, one of differing beliefs. In John the description of "one another" never includes an individual outside the elect community. The synoptics report Jesus' words to love one's enemy (e.g., Mt. 5:43ff.), but in John the emphasis is centered entirely upon Jesus' love of τοὺς ἰδίους. When πλησίον and ἀλλήλους are confused and used interchangeably the sharp issue involved in the careful delineation of those terms is lost. Spicq, for example, clouds the issue in this way and by so doing he tries to make John's emphasis on love relate to a pronounced demand for the disciple to love his neighbor not as himself, as with the synoptics, but "more than himself."[41] He misses the dualism which is essential for the johannine dialogue when he incorporates both poles of the issue into a unified whole.

---

[38] Westcott, The Gospel According to St. John, p. 198.

[39] Via, "Darkness, Christ, and the Church in the Fourth Gospel," p. 125.

[40] Prunet, La morale chrétienne, pp. 114-115. This position is represented well by Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, p. 451; Morrison, "Mission and Ethic; an Interpretation of John 17," Interp. 19 (1965), p. 271; and Schnackenburg, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, p. 328.

A service has been rendered johannine exegesis by C. Ratschow in his study of the different meanings which emerged in the early church with reference to the terms of neighbor-love and brother-love. In his study, "Agape. Nächstenliebe und Bruderliebe," he shows that the writings of the early church evidence a continual progression toward exclusiveness in the church, and the final solution to the pristine distinction between neighbor and brother was effected when "neighbor" finally became the designation for a member of the Christian community.[42] Why these changes occurred, Ratschow argues, may be attributed to "the various kerygmatic situations" faced by the different Christian communities.[43] This conclusion ties Ratschow's essay to the study of John, and suggests that the situation of the johannine community could in large measure be responsible for the way John has employed brother-love. Such a conclusion is at the heart of this disquisition.

---

[41] Spicq, Agape in the New Testament, Vol. 3, p. 54.

[42] C. H. Ratschow, "Agape. Nächstenliebe und Bruderliebe," ZST 21 (1950), p. 177.

[43] Ibid., p. 160.

Stauffer has written of the Book of Revelation:

> In Revelation the demand for brotherly love (2:19) is completely overshadowed by the passionate call to cling fast to God in this hour of division and distress, even to death. Here the understanding of what love means is completely determined by the thinking of a theology of martyrdom which has come to new life in the needs of the day.[44]

Given the conclusion that John's gospel was written in response to a persecution situation, the statement offered by Stauffer for the Book of Revelation may be appropriated for the Gospel of John as well. The context which gives meaning to the johannine commandment to love one another is elucidated in the persecution crisis of the community. The evidence presented in chapter two demonstrated that the dualistic contrast of cosmos-elect community was the vivid theological interpretation applied to the climacterics precipitated by the Jewish persecutions. High priority is given in the farewell discourse to the preservation of the community in the midst of continual threats upon its existence. Here, too, martyrdom determines the understanding of what brotherly love involves.

The restrictive brotherly love ethic pronounced by

---

[44] E. Stauffer, "αγαπᾶω ," TDNT, Vol. 1, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Wm. Eerdmans, 1964, p. 53.

John is part of the attempt to preserve the community's integrity as a covenantal, elect people in the face of an onslaught by the cosmos (15:18ff.), the cosmos as represented by hostile Judaism (16:1ff.). Still the question remains, what concrete meaning may be given to agape? Is it open to further delineation and is something concrete meant in the response of agape to one's brother?

Even in spite of the fact that the exhortation to love is not accompanied by an abundance of rules or details, it is quite specific in the sense of purpose and direction. It is not a universal charge, one which would be spoken to all men. That is to say, (1) it is not an exhortation as to how the Christian should act toward all men; and (2) it is not a general gnome addressed to any man in the entire human situation. Thus, even though 15:13 ("Greater love has no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends") might properly be called a general aphorism known by the ancient world,[45] it is applied by the evangelist in his own particular theology in such a way that it ceases to be such a general exhortation. Quite the opposite of a universal command, agape in John is tied to the persecution context and it is for this reason that the content of agape is provided by the accompanying martyr's example. This example is succinctly stated in 15:12-14: "This is my commandment that you love one another just as I have loved you. Love greater than this nobody has that someone should give his life on behalf of his friends. You are my friends if you do what I command you." With much forcefulness and with concentrated focusing of attention, John puts forward his case: (1) love one another as I loved you; (2) the greatest love is shown if a man dies for his friends; (3) you are my friends if you fulfill the love which I commanded you. The one speaking in the present tense is the martyred one, the one who died. That is the kind of agape which is at the core of John's intention. As Corell says, "If 15:13 is meant not merely to refer to the death of Jesus but also to illustrate the behavior of true disciples, then we have here a reminder of the reality of martyrdom in the early church."[46] In this same context 13:1 is of special interest. At the beginning of the farewell address John writes: ". . . having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them εἰς τέλος ." Whether one translates this last phrase as an adverb "completely,"[47] or as a temporal phrase "until the end," the meaning rendered is materially the same. The connotation of martyrdom is inseparable from this beginning sentence of the discourse, just as it is from 15:13. Jesus, the revealer, died at the hands of the world without breaking the covenant made with τοὺς ἰδίους . And just as the world could not tolerate Jesus, so they cannot now tolerate those who continue in his name. Thus, by describing the agape of Jesus as that of an unyielding covenant unto death, the disciples are presented with what is required of them in their time of trial. Pointing to this setting, Spicq said: "If the agape of charity is active and giving, the perfect charity will be, accordingly, total sacrifice; most important, the voluntary death will be the characteristic proof of the agape."[48] Such a death is not portrayed as a death on behalf of some principle of faith; rather, it is a death which results from service to Jesus' own.

---

[45] See the references cited in Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 417, n. 4.

---

[46] Corell, Consummatum est, p. 95.

[47] See Blass-Debrunner-Funk, A Greek Grammar, p. 112, para. 207 (3) for the use of εἰς here. This is probably the best translation. Spicq, Agape in the New Testament, Vol. 3, p. 53, translates the term temporally, "to the end."

This argument is further supported by the observation that the passion account is the occasion for these farewell notes. This suggests that the passion is viewed as a martyr's death by John. The way John handles the passion scene gives added weight to this suggestion: Jesus goes to his death voluntarily and in firm control of the situation, for it is by his death that he is glorified by the Father. To be sure, John does not have Jesus talk of his death but of his glorification. This way of writing about Jesus' passion is a forerunner of the way Cyprian expressed the passion of later martyrs: ". . . with glorious and deserved praise, the glorious--I will not say deaths, but--immortalities of the martyrs. . . ."[49] Death was an improper word in so far as the martyr figure went to death in control of the situation.[50] John has constructed his passion account with such an understanding of Jesus' death in mind. Riddle is correct in observing, ". . . the Fourth Gospel is the most thoroughgoing of the four (gospels) in picturing Jesus as the deliberate martyr. . . .Jesus' death is the voluntary act by which he draws the world to himself."[51] Jesus died faithfully in accordance with God's will. He did not die at the whims of the cosmos or due to the strength of Satan. This was obviously an important point for the early Christians since the outward appearance of persecutions, whether extensive or local in area, suggested that Satan and his demonic powers were in control.

---

[48] Spicq, "Notes d'éxegèse johannique. La charité est amour manifest," RB 65 (1958), p. 362; also Agape in the New Testament, Vol. 3, p. 43.

The agape prescribed on the eve of Jesus' death was intrinsically related to the cross,[52] thereby manifesting a theologia crucis. Käsemann is incorrect in asserting that there is only a theologia gloriae in the Gospel of John.[53] Certainly the life and death of Jesus are presented in glowing affirmations of such a theologia gloriae by John. But that is done because the farewell discourse is responding to a real *crux* of the disciples as they live in the world. The crucifixion is pictured as glorification, and not death, because the cross looms as the near and fearful claim to be made upon the disciples.

---

[49] As quoted by Riddle, The Martyrs, p. 36.

[50] Ibid., p. 120.

[51] Ibid., p. 205.

[52] Spicq, Agape in the New Testament, Vol. 3, pp. 53-54.

[53] Käsemann, Jesu letzter Wille, p. 94.

Although the letter from the churches in Lyons and Vienne telling of the persecution there in 177 A.D. is quite late and is of little value for a strict comparison with John's gospel, it is instructive to note how that letter proclaimed a *theologia gloriae* in response to persecution. As Eusebius quotes, the letter records the words of John 16:2 which are now fulfilled in Lyons: πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας ὑμᾶς δόξει λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ .[54] But, that Satan was not victorious nor his methods to be feared is expressed in the behavior of Sanctus who remained faithful in persecution: ". . . but Christ suffering in him manifested great glory, overthrowing the adversary and showing for the example of the others how there is nothing fearful where there is the love of the Father nor painful where there is the glory of Christ."[55]

John is an earlier example of such outward confidence. As part of instruction and exhortation, John presents Jesus as the proto-martyr: Jesus goes to his death willingly. Thereby, John shows that there is nothing to be feared in death. Yet, this is a response made in light of a larger problem which is the absence of the Lord (cf. chapter two). By all outward appearances, Satan won the battle over Jesus for Jesus was crucified and killed. Yet, Christians believed that Jesus still lived. When persecution arose for those far removed from the time of Jesus and the threat of apostasy was present, the bolstering of faith and faithfulness was attempted by the presentation of the *theologia gloriae*. In death glorification comes--that is the message which John gives to the besieged community. One could conclude that the situation demanded a *theologia gloriae* if hope was not to be abandoned. The community needed reassurance that it will be victorious in spite of provocations by the world and, indeed, through his christological representation John can assert that in Jesus it is already victorious (16:33).

---

[54] Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, V. 1.15.

[55] *Ibid*., V. 1.23.

It is fortuitous to argue, as has Dibelius, that agape in John has to do not with ethical relationships but with a cosmic *Wesensgemeinschaft* between the believer and Jesus or God.[56] Since the relationship has to do not with human relationships but with supra-human relationships it is not ethical, so Dibelius argues. However, the motivation for the farewell speech is assuredly the human relationships of the community and how the individuals respond to one another faithfully within that community. Jesus, as the revealer of

---

[56] Dibelius, "John 15:13," pp. 173, 175. See the discussion of this in chapter 1 above, p. 5 . Käsemann also shares this view: "love is not a feeling and therefore it transcends the region of ethical decisions," *Jesu letzter Wille*, p. 110.

God (in a way similar to that of Moses for the Israelites) acts among men. However, when he is gone the community must learn to rely on its own association to give meaning to their communal faith as the elect people of God. John has employed the traditions concerning Jesus as the martyr, to give substance to what was expected of the elect. Jesus died in service to his own; he was steadfast to his friends until the very end. For John the covenant is a bond among the elect and it is that relationship which is revelation of God, and therefore of life itself. Jesus' death resulted because he was steadfast to his own and he did not desert them. Such is the faithfulness expected of his followers in their time of crisis.

The relationship of Jesus to his disciples in his passion hour is also the subject of the footwashing scene in 13:2ff.[57] As is commonly observed, two parts constitute the footwashing scene: 13:6-11 where the subject is the washing proper, and 13:12-17 where the explanation for the washing is given by Jesus. Even if these two pericopae were originally two units of differing theological significance,[58] as they are connected in John the meaning is obviously tied to the explanation given by Jesus in 13:12-17 in which he says:

---

[57] Those who do make a positive connection between the interpretation of the footwashing and the event and understanding of the passion and cross include Prunet, Schlatter, Hirsch, Schweizer, Via, and Barrett.

[58] As Bultmann has argued, Johannes-Evangelium, pp. 355-365, cf. the summary on p. 365.

"For I have given you an example (ὑπόδειγμα) that you should do just as I have done to you."[59] This is a reference to his own act of service to his disciples and, as such, is tied to the completeness of his service of 13:1. Here, too, there is the limitation to the community: and you ought to wash *one another's* feet, 13:14. But in what sense is the use of ὑπόδειγμα intended here? The word itself can be employed to indicate a copy or imitation, or, less restrictively, an example, model, or pattern of action.[60] Given the scene of the passion night, and chapter 13's intimacy with that event, it seems exegetically correct to interpret the intention of ὑπόδειγμα as a specific model of action which can be broadly reinacted by Jesus' followers. The intention is not for a model to repeat the footwashing itself,[61] but it is intended to give an example for action in the persecution faced by the readers. By including the widely known apothegm of 13:16; "I say to you, a servant is not greater than his master, nor is he who is sent greater than he who sent him," John gives a sense to the described scene which points to the broader concern with the passion and with the situation of the disciples. Such is the conclusion of Hirsch who contends that this aphorism is tied, in common with the synoptics, e.g., Mt. 10:24, to the meaning that the disciples must suffer persecution like their master. By washing the feet of the disciples on the night of his passion Jesus shows that his death is a service to his own.[62] Therefore, the example is that of a death in behalf of the covenant community.[63] The service portrayed in the footwashing is a part of what it means to talk about Jesus having loved his own:

---

[59] There continues to be discussion as to whether or not the footwashing proper is a sacramental act. An adequate summary of this debate can be found in G. Richter, *Die Fusswaschung im Johannesevangelium. Geschichte ihrer Deutung*, Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1967, especially chapter 6 dealing with the current discussions.

[60] W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. by W. Arndt and F. Gingrish, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957, p. 851.

[61] In contradistinction to Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis*, Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1908, p. 59, Loisy, *Le quatrieme Evangile*, p. 388, and Lohmeyer, "Die Fusswaschung," *ZNW* 38 (1939), p. 89. These exegetes view the sacramental and the ethical as one and the same. A. Schweitzer, in *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. by William Montgomery, London: A. & C. Black, 1931, p. 352, contends that both (he does not equate them formally) the ethical and sacramental are intended here. The footwashing is an act of humility which the disciples are to repeat, but it is also a washing of the disciples which brings them into being-in-Christ

---

(p. 360). The mystical meaning of the washing stands behind the ethical. Having said that, however, Schweizer proceeds to show only that the foot washing is the sacramental initiation of the disciples through which the reception of the Spirit becomes possible. Procedurally, he looks for verification of the mystical being-in-Christ and does not see the distinctive communal context to which this discourse speaks.

[62] Hirsch, Das vierte Evangelium, pp. 330-333.

[63] See Hans von Campenhausen, "Zur Auslegung von Joh. 13:6-10," ZNW 32 (1933), pp. 259-260 where he discusses the model which is portrayed here as that of humility (Demut). Prunet's analysis and conclusions, in La morale chrétienne, p. 43, simply go much too far beyond the intention of John when he describes the moral qualities of Jesus here and in the farewell discourse as: humility, total abnegation, patience in acceptance of the accusations, uprightness in failure, patience in fearlessness, perfect confidence in God. These qualities, for the most part, are simply not emphasized nor are they a concern for John.

εἰς τέλος : his service was one of revelation and a vital aspect of that revelation was the understanding of what it meant to be a covenant participant. From that comprehension arises the ethical content of the model given.

The conclusion reached by Dodd regarding the footwashing leads into a more general problem in John and his farewell discourse. Dodd concludes: "The primary meaning of the story (the footwashing) is to be found in the idea of imitatio christi, expressed quite simply in 13:15."[64] What is the relation between the ethic envisioned by John and imitatio christi? That is, does John call for the disciples to act in imitation of the action of Jesus? The argument against such an imitatio christi in this sense rests on the supposition that John is concerned with a metaphysical dualism when he talks of unity with Jesus and, therefore, there is really no concern for action which would approximate that of Jesus as described in the footwashing.[65] This concern revolves around the argument that the change from the old person to a new _Wesen_ is one of cosmic dimension unconcerned with earthly character or action.

---

[64] Dodd, Historical Tradition, p. 62. Imitatio Christi is a proper designation for what is being described here. Betz's allocation of this term and its specific meaning to the mid second century is, though philologically exact, bound too heavily to vocabulary distinctions and the analysis misses, therefore, the intention of a text's such as John's (Betz, Nachfolge und Nachahmung, p. 4).

[65] Such a case is made by Dibelius, "Joh. 15:13," especially pages 173-175. An example of an opposite position is taken by Prunet. Prunet considers the union which is talked about in the relation of Jesus to the father, and accordingly of the disciples to Jesus, as one of a moral unity and not of a unity in nature as Dibelius maintains. Prunet's argument fits well with the discussion of the imitatio christi which is suggested in the following paragraph.

The argument supporting an _imitatio christi_ in John rests primarily on two verses, 15:13 and 13:15 and the accompanying pericopae. The aphorism reproduced in 15:13 appears to be given to propagate such action by listeners. That Jesus died for his friends is presupposed by this exhortation and it follows quite naturally, as has already been suggested above,[66] that the disciples are to do likewise. 13:15 states bluntly that the disciples are to follow the example which Jesus has given them: "For I have given you an example, that you also should do as I have done to you." The crucial element here is, once again, the covenant presupposed by these verses. The service to be rendered by the disciples is toward the covenant members. The agape is a concrete act, as evidenced by Jesus' washing the feet and steadfastly dying for his own. Thus the evangelist asserts that the object of love, the savior, is bound to the community of love.[67] It follows that the disciples are to reproduce in their mutual love the love shown by Jesus in laying down his life.[68] In this connection one may speak of an _imitatio christi_ pervading the farewell discourse. It is of course a clear supposition in this section that such action by the disciples is not equal or identical with that of the Christ. However, in the time of Christ's absence, when he resides in glorification and the disciples remain in the world, they are to react toward one another in a fashion befitting their covenantal calling. By such action the disciples are caught up in a fate similar to that of Jesus,[69] i.e., death at the hand of the world; but even this fate appears to authenticate their steadfastness as is translucently suggested in 15:18-16:4a.

---

[66] See p. 159.

[67] Faulhaber, _Das Johannesevangelium und die Kirche_, Kassel: Johannes Strada Verlag, 1938, p. 37.

[68] Dodd, _The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel_, p. 405.

Agape is the specific commandment offered in the farewell discourse. It is a concrete act, not a universal ideal. It is tied to the intimacy of the covenant community and the persecution of that group. Agape is the service of one member for another member. The highest expression of that love is the martyr's death, a death by which one remains true to both covenant and community and thus preserves the integrity of both.[70] Such is the simplicity of agape, and its basis comes

---

[69] E. Schweizer, Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern, Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1955, p. 145.

[70] As Campenhausen says, ". . . . the disciples are no longer 'Knechte' but have become Jesus' friends and brothers, 'born of God,' and partake as such for the 'Name's' sake his fate of suffering and persecution in the world (John 15:20f.)." Die Idee des Martyriums, p. 56.

The death itself was not so significant as what might be accomplished thereby. In later literature one of the rewards of going through such a death included intercession for one's earthly companions (Riddle, The Martyrs, p. 37). Such prayer, from the other side of death in immortality, had especial benefit. John likewise presents this possibility, cf. 14:13; 16:23-24. Surkau mentions this as one of the from the example given by the revealer himself who served and died on behalf of his own. It is he who exhorts and who lives this covenant completely to the end. Faithfulness to the covenant and its members demonstrates, as well, that agape and belief cannot be separated. As Bultmann has observed: "In chronology the hearing of the word precedes the *Liebesentscheidung* for the brother. But *sachlich* the two are not to be thought of chronologically, but as a unity."[71] In the time of the long departed revealer, the brother-love remains as the sure sign of faithfulness to his name against the disruption of the world's oppressing powers.

Bearing Fruit

A third theme which forms a part of the entree to the johannine ethic is καρπὸν φέρειν (John 15:2, 4, 5, 8, 16; 12:24). Chapter 15:1-11 contains the metaphor from which the investigation of the concept may proceed. From the context and the way the metaphor developes, it is clear that 15:1-11 makes reference to the *tree* of life, as associated with numerous examples found in the Mandean literature.[72] It is

---

convictions of the community, that the offering of one's life in martyrdom had much value for the entire community (*Martyrien*, p. 7).

[71] Bultmann, *Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 421.

[72] See Schweizer, *Ego Eimi*, pp. 46-81, and Bultmann, "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannes-evangeliums," *ZNW* 24 (1925), pp. 100-146, for discussions of the issues involved in arriving at such a conclusion. It is not a black and white issue as even a quick glance at Isaiah 5 shows.

not, therefore, concerned with the ἄμπελος as a vine and hence to be associated with the sacrament of the lord's supper.[73] The concern of the pericope is with the supporting trunk of the vine and the branches which shoot off from that trunk. The emphasis is upon the branches and their dependence on the trunk.[74]

"Bearing fruit" is the result of the relationship of the branches to the vine. By bearing fruit the branches show that they are an intimate part of the stock, taking life from that stock and producing fruit as it is their purpose to do. However, if they are dead branches which show no life, they are cut off from the vine and destroyed. From the metaphor it is apparent that discipleship is the fruit (15:8), and one shows himself to be a part of the community if he bears fruit.

The use of "bear fruit" in John 15 is explicated further by the aphorism in 12:24ff. In that saying the stress is upon the seed which must die in order to bring forth fruit. The only suggestion which is made concerning what such fruit would be is given in the following verses, 25-26: "He who loves his life loses it, and he who hates his life in this world will keep it for eternal life. If anyone serves me he must follow me; and where I am, there shall my servant be also." The point of concentration is again on the martyr's death.

---

[73] Against the opinion of Cullmann, *Les sacrements dans l'Évangile johannique*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1951.

[74] The use of this metaphor is similar to Paul's use of the body where the head stands over all of the parts of the body in his hierarchical depiction.

The meaning of 15:1-11 is clarified in 15:12-17, and the two sections are parallel.[75] Just as the theme of agape in 15:12ff. serves to explicate the meaning of the first part of chapter 15, so also 15:1ff. can serve to elucidate 15:12ff. The material correspondence of these two pericopae shows that they are concerned with the same theme, namely, what it means to be a part of the covenant community instituted by Jesus; and, in turn, this is placed in the broader context of chapter 15 as a whole with the accompanying references to the hate of the world and persecution (vs. 15:18-16:4a). 15:1-17 is presented as an introduction and preface to the discussion of 15:18ff.

Both passages, 15:1ff. and 12:24ff., are important for the construction intended in the use of "bear fruit," and they aid in showing as well the interrelatedness of both situations. From these contexts it may be stated that bearing fruit in John is related with the worn phrase of "good works" and it is thus related to the Old Testament, Rabbinic, and the general New Testament use of the term. Isaiah 5 is a good example of this in earlier Hebrew history. In that setting the vineyard, Israel, is called upon to *produce* justice and righteousness. The decidedly ethical character of that chapter is clear. Barth has said in this connection: "We had better apply the Old Testament meaning of this part of the parable (the reference is to chapter 15 in John): the bringing of fruit was always meant as a symbol of doing righteous works."[76] Even if such a general conclusion is stated too bluntly, the ethical quality of the term is the usual connotation.[77] Strack-Billerbeck arrives at the same general conclusion with regard to the Old Testament use of "bear fruit."[78] Fully aware of the implicit danger of quoting the rabbinic quotations from this source, which generally appear out of their appropriate contexts, their references lead toward the same general conclusion, e.g., Sota 46a where fruits are conceived as the "fulfillment of a command."[79]

---

[75] They are parallel passages, but both appear to be the work of the evangelist. The problem of redaction is not at stake here. Even those who postulate a revelation source here find continuity between vs. 1-10 and 11-17, even though there are redacted sentences within that section. Cf. Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, pp. 406ff., and H. Becker, Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsreden, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956, p. 134.

---

[76] C. Barth, "Disciples of the Servant," *SEAJT*, 6-7 (April-July, 1965), p. 16. Mussner also sees this as having ethical implications and states that the lasting quality of the *Lebensgemeinschaft* with Christ is dependent upon the ethical verification, upon the 'fruit' which man brings. "If the Christian remains ethically unfruitful then he is cut off from the community and from Christ." (*ΖΩΗ. Die Anschauung vom "Leben" im vierten Evangelium*, München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1952, p. 149.)

[77] E.g., Jer. 2:21; Ez. 19:10-14; 15:1-6.

[78] Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, Vol. 1, p. 466, offers the conclusion: "The Old Testament often used the metaphor for the designation of the following of a mode of conduct."

[79] Strathmann, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, makes a similar observation and adds that faith and obedience were the fruit expected of Israel (p. 217).

New Testament examples show their relationship with those of the Old Testament. Matthew 7:15-20 offers a parallel metaphor to that of John 15, which seems to be derived from a parallel tradition rather than from direct transmission. Here the dichotomy is provided by the examples of the good tree and the bad tree with their good and evil fruits respectively. Every tree which does not bear good fruit (καρπὸν καλόν) is cut down and thrown into the fire (7:19. 12:33ff. refers to the same metaphor of good and bad trees and their accompanying fruits). Here Jesus calls the Pharisees evil, because their hearts are evil and they do not, therefore, bring forth good (fruit).[80] Colossians 1:10 is even more explicit when it includes in Paul's prayer that the Colossians be "bearing fruit" in every good work." Galatians proceeds to enumerate the fruits of the Spirit: "love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, and goodness" (5:22). Certainly an ethical context cannot be excluded from these qualities.

John's use of bearing fruit accords with this general display of examples from the Old and New Testaments,[81] which show a decidedly ethical stance, i.e., related to man's relationship to man. The further elucidation of such a fruit in John is tied to its specific context, and 12:24 opens up the relationship of bearing fruit to the other ethical terms already discussed. The setting is the entry into Jerusalem, the beginning of the passion. Jesus proclaims that the time of the Son of Man to be glorified has come and immediately he states that he who loses his life to this world is the one who saves it for eternal life; and, his true disciple is the one who follows him, for "where I am, there will my servant be also (12:26)." The martyr's death is held out as the appropriate example by which one's fruit is judged,[82] and the community is that group in which the meaning and significance of such actions are properly appropriated.

---

[80] Parallels to these passages include, among others: Mt. 3:8; Lk. 3:8; Lk. 6:43; Lk. 13:9. E. Kamlah concludes that generally in rabbinic writing the fruits were "the fulfilling of the commandments and good works." (Die Form der katalogischen Paraenese im Neuen Testament, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964, p. 182.)

[81] Bultmann notes the rare occurrence of this metaphor in Mandean literature, cf. Johannes-Evangelium, p. 409, n. 5. Schweizer can offer only the same rare parallels as Bultmann and they are not conclusive, cf. Ego Eimi, pp. 45, 157-160. It seems most likely that John's rendering stems from the Old Testament thought world.

---

[82] Such an interpretation differs radically from that of seeing the "bearing of fruit" as missionary zeal and productivity. Behler, for example, says that the fruits or works intended are those which will establish and spread the Kingdom of God, and that means "souls connected to Christ through apostolic preaching." (*The Last Discourse of Jesus*, translated by Robert T. Francoeur, Baltimore: Helicon, 1965, p. 162.) Lazure thinks that the one who eats and drinks the flesh and blood in communion is the one who bears fruit (*Les valeurs morales*, p. 37, n. 65), but such sacramentalism is not in accord with the nonsacramental character of the farewell discourse, or the gospel in general. Nor is the fruit here mentioned the fruit of answered prayer as several commentators have suggested (e.g., Grundmann, "Das Wort von Jesu Freunden (John 15:13-16) und das Herrenmahl," *NT* 3 (1959), p. 73; Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis*, pp. 63-64. Answered prayer is certainly a gift afforded to followers, but there is no association between prayer and fruit unless it would be that the one who bears fruit will in turn have his prayers answered, as 15:16 seems to imply: "...I gave to you in order that you might go and bear fruit and that your fruit might remain in order that whatever you ask the father for he might give it to you in my name." The bearing of fruit appears here *before*, as a preceding event, to the answered prayer. Heise captures the mood of "bearing fruit" as it has been envisioned in this paper: "The karpon pherein means that the disciples exist in faith in the power of love. Such

Just as has been observed previously with the discussions of "agape" and "keeping the commandments," it is important to discern that bearing fruit is a narrowly intended term in John, bound to the passion and martyr setting. Schweizer has commented that "man has no criterion over the revelation in his hand, and cannot be sure what is "fruit" and what is not "fruit."[83] However, for John man does indeed have a criterion by which to judge his relationship to the savior, and that is his discernable relationship to the community of believers, and, more precisely, his relation of steadfastness to his partners in faith in the periods of crisis as vividly suggested in 15:18ff. Bearing fruit, as 12:24 shows, is bound to the conviction that life in this cosmos is nothing to be valued in itself, even though the revealer expects believers to continue in the world (17:11. 15), and that eternal life is to be gained by dying in the service of the brothers, which is likewise service to the lord. Likewise Bultmann's perception is incorrect: "There is no criterion by which to ascertain the rightness of the revelatory claims, be they trustworthy testimonies of

---

existence is a Dasein for the others, who have the strength to do that which is necessary in the concrete situation and, thereby, have no need to fear death." The martyr situation demanded of the johannine church brings forth from John the appeal for steadfastness to the covenant in the face of death, which is a steadfastness toward the brother.

[83] Schweizer, Ego Eimi, p. 159, n. 109.

another, be they rational or ethical measures, be they inner experiences. Only faith opens up the object of faith."[84] The verification of faith *claims* is criterionless, but the authenticity of *faithfulness* can be guaged in the discipleship of one for his brother; that is the verification which has objective meaning. John has furnished the visible, objective criterion of faithfulness. It is not an inner, mystical quality; rather it is an action effective in the covenant group, and hence observable to all who view the issue in a similar way.[85] Bearing fruit is the visible act of steadfastness in the face of apostasy and the support for the covenant community such as is visible in the paradigm of Jesus' death on behalf of his own.

Remaining in Jesus

In close connection with the exhortation to bear fruit is the exhortation μένειν ἐν ἐμοί (John 15:4, 5, 6, 7).[86]

---

[84] Bultmann, *Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 199.

[85] It is important to reiterate that there is no dichotomy, for John's thinking, between the inner person and his outer acts. Westcott's attempt to divide the two is futile: "Such works (14:12) flow from the Son and from those in fellowship with him; but the life and the nature lie deeper (*The Gospel According to St. John*, p. 204)." Such a separation is not to be found in the farewell discourse; on the contrary, what faith and discipleship mean are visible features of life and are not hidden from view. Even the world can see the evidence (e.g., 13:35, and even 14:31 shows that in so far as the world can see and can supposedly conclude certain things from Jesus' response to his own death) even though they might reject the faith itself.

[86] That there is such a close connection between the two has been expressed by Bultmann as well: to remain in Jesus is to bear fruit and to bear fruit is to remain in Jesus (*Johannes-Evangelium*, p. 412).

Its association with bearing fruit is determined by the vine metaphor of which both terms are a part. The relationship is especially close in that the emphasis of both terms is the same. Although an essential aspect of the picture is the stem as it gives life to the branches, the real thrust is concerned with the action of the branches themselves. Expressed differently, the emphasis is not on the "living from" (παρ’ ἐμοί) but is rather the "remaining in" (μένειν ἐν ἐμοί).[87] The context and content of the imperative "remain in me" is ecclesiological[88] and covenantal. This conclusion is supported by the vine metaphor itself. The branches are easily equated with the church. Further, in verse 9 the "remain in me" is changed slightly to read "remain in my love," and what follows shows explicitly that the one who loves his brother is the one who keeps the commandment and is thus the one who remains in Jesus' love (vs. 10-12 [14]). The referent throughout these verses is the community of believers. However, in saying that the meaning intended in "remaining" is ecclesiastical it is not necessary to take the step Schweizer has done and to conclude: "For this church there is really no way more to go, no struggle to withstand, no goal to reach. For it there is only the "remaining" in Jesus and all advancing is dangerous. Essentially it is already at its goal."[89] The context established in chapter two provides evidence that the goal is yet to be attained. Struggle is still present. Remaining is not a stagnant existence, but a relationship to which one must be faithful if it is really "remaining."

---

[87] See Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes*, Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1930, p. 306, to 15:4; and J. Heise, *Bleiben. Meinein in den johanneischen Schriften*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1967, p. 6. On p. 87 Heise argues, "It is not completely correct . . . that the remaining in him . . . is identical with the bringing of fruit." Although this does not have to do with the two items of different times following one upon the other, yet there is still a distinction between the two as John uses them. Heise does not explain what the difference is, and his discussion does not explicate the slight distinction which he supposedly intends. For example, he remarks: "In order to bring forth fruit, they only need to remain who they are." If one does not take this in a chronological sense, which Heise has denied above, then the distinction is tenuous indeed. Unless, of course, one wants to argue merely on the basis of the different involvement associated with the two words, i.e., remaining as a more passive connotation and bearing fruit as being a more active denotation.

[88] Corell has called μένειν an ecclesiastical term and his judgment is likely correct (*Consummatum est*, p. 189).

There are further ramifications of the observation that the vine metaphor and the call to "remain in me" are concerned with the covenant community. To say that it concerns the church is also to say that there is an observable criterion of what remaining is, and that criterion is the unity of the body of the faithful. The concern for community is seen often, in the footwashing, in the vine, etc., and the emphasis appears to be placed on the care of one's brother.

---

[89] Schweizer, "Die Kirchenbegriff im Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes," Neotestamentica, p. 264. Käsemann would assuredly draw the same conclusion, since he holds the same views concerning the enthusiastic character of the community to whom John writes (see Jesu letzter Wille, pp. 53ff.).

The individual is not judged by himself, in an isolated "spiritual" context. On the contrary, faithfulness is to be viewed within the integrity of the covenant body. It is in this sense that Bultmann's conclusion is forcefully put: "As always love is not thought of as a personal effect but as the being for others, which completely determines the individual's existence."[90] So it is that the exhortation to "remain in me" can be verified by one's response to his fellow believers within the community of the new covenant.

Because the relationship implied in the appeal to "remain" is directed to one's place within the community of belief, it is tied also to the love relationship (v. 9ff.). That is to say, in turn, that this whole section of 15:1-17 is ethically conceived, as Dobschutz has contended.[91] That ethical concern relates to the faithfulness of the individual toward the other members of the covenant community, and that is tied, as already stated, to the passion account which is so pugently advanced in 15:13ff. The community is set against the cosmos, and the concern is one of steadfastness to the elect, the support of the brothers, and, hence, the unity (17:21) of the community.

---

[90] Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 415.

[91] Dobschütz, "Zum Charakter des vierten Evangeliums," ZNW 28 (1929), pp. 174-175. He connects the thoughts of "remain in me" with the appeal to "keep my words:" "The thought 'remain in me' (6:56; 15:4ff.) glides immediately over into 'keep my words, do my words' (15:10; 14:15), as the 'I in you' is taken up with 'my words in you.' This 'remain in my speech,' however, which is the first thing which makes one into a real disciple (8:31) is throughout ethically conceived." Hoskyns also connects the two exhortations "abide in my love" and "keep my commandments" and ties the two to an ethical stance. Mussner, ΖΩΗ, pp. 154-155, also argues that these phrases must not be taken in a psychological-ecstasy sense, "but must be understood in a personal-ethical sense."

Remaining Faithful

The relation of the preceding themes to the ethic of John is corroborated further when the understanding of πιστεύειν in the Fourth Gospel is penetrated. Although the word πιστεύειν is not absent from the farewell discourse, it is interesting that the term itself is not of vital importance for that section. The rarity of the word here is likely due to the fact that the farewell address is especially concerned with, and addressed to, those who are already within the body of believers. So, even though there is certainly question as to the validity and authenticity of the faith of those within the community,[92] the discussion does not center on the term itself but on the inner workings and ramifications of the faith professed. The reason for advancing the question of πιστεύειν in the farewell discourse is to determine the relationship of belief to the response in ethical action of that faith. Such a relationship can be seen by inquiring into the nature of belief as conceived by the evangelist.

John's understanding of the faith relationship needs to be placed in conjunction with its hebraic background. The hebraic term translated by πιστεύειν is אמן . Generally, the Hebrew use of אמן can be ". . . shown to be a general concept the content of which is determined differently in each case by the particular thing it describes."[93] Accordingly, the niphal use (נאמין) shows that a thing is as it ought to be. For example, I Samuel 3:20 shows Samuel to be a true prophet because he is in his life what a prophet should be. Deuteronomy 7:9 says that God is faithful (נאמין) because he keeps his covenant, which is to say that he is what he says he is. Also of importance for the johannine discussion is the hiphil use of the term (האמן) in which the meaning refers to saying "amen" to something with all of the consequences accompanying such an affirmation. The acceptance of a thing as true indicates an attitude, i.e., state or action, appropriate to the item reported.[94] Accordingly, Deut. 9:23 shows that belief is tied directly to the obedience of a word or command. Affirmation means carrying out that which is affirmed. Such a tenor is upheld in the New Testament as well. Hebrews 11 says that "to believe the words is to obey them."[95] Such a meaning is also carried through in the patterns of John. Bultmann confirms this when he concludes, with respect to the connection of faith and love in John:

---

[92] Especially 16:30-31; 14:12.

---

[93] As quoted from Weiser in Faith. Bible Key Words from G. Kittel's TWNT, by R. Bultmann and A. Weiser, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1961, p. 5.

[94] Ibid., p. 10.

[95] See the interpretation of Bultmann in his discussion of πιστεύειν , Ibid., p. 63.

> But it is possible for his (the believer's) removal out of the world to be demonstrated, namely by his conduct. This is generally called keeping the commandments or alternatively, the word given by Jesus. These phrases can describe the obedience and the loyalty of faith, and equally the conduct resulting from faith. The double meaning of the phrases (i.e., those of faith and love) indicates the inner unity of faith and action. . . . For since faith knows Jesus as the revealer of the divine love, and by the receiving of love, loving feelings spring up from the believer.[96]

The underlying connection between the hebraic understanding of belief and the johannine understanding which Bultmann summarizes is certainly supported from the johannine text. In 8:31 those who believe are those who have the word of Jesus abiding in them and this word leads them to the truth.[97] In turn, those who do not believe are those in whom the word is not abiding (5:38). The Midrashic Pericope of 3:16-21 is explicit in stating that many are unbelievers: "because their deeds are evil," and, vice versa, he who believes and "does what is true comes to the light that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in God (3:21)." 12:44 suggests that the one who hears Jesus' sayings and keeps them is the true believer. Thus, the connection described already by the Hebrew union of assent and obedience is firmly grounded in johannine thinking as well.[98]

---

[96] Ibid., p. 109.

[97] The doing of the word is united with the thrust of this discussion. The word is not a possession but, as with John's understanding of the entire Christian expression, is verbal and hence has an active connotation.

[98] For fuller treatments of the meaning and significance of believing in John, see R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 2, pp. 70-92 and C. H. Dodd, The

Such an intimate relationship exists as well between John's use of πιστεύειν and the understanding of faith as it develops in the intertestamental period of Judaism. Increasingly, πιστεύειν came to be viewed as the expression of faithfulness, loyalty, steadfastness and endurance. Evidence suggests that in these turbulent times "the trustworthiness of God and the faith of the pious accord with one another and it has to do, on both sides, with the abiding in the covenant trust."[99] Many general and specific references to such an emphasis of πιστεύειν can be compiled from the period under consideration. Generally, the new emphasis from the Maccabean times on the martyrdom of the great figures of Hebrew history points in such a direction, e.g., in the writings dealing with the deaths of Isaiah, of Jeremiah, and especially of Abraham.[100] Meyer catches the flavor of the feeling when he asserts, "faith in late Judaism, under the

---

Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 179-186. In relation to the more general framework of the biblical expression see R. Bultmann and A. Weiser, Faith.

[99] A. Meyer, Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes, Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1930, p. 131. Weiser also demonstrates that the idea of loyalty often stands out in the rabbinic period. It is such that faith must be preserved in affliction ("πιστις p. 47): "Great in the sight of God is loyalty to faith" (Mekihilta to Ex. 14:31 and 15:1). This quality is probably also meant when works and faith are combined (e.g., II Esdras 9:7; 13:22) (p. 46-47).

[100] See the brief, but helpful, discussion in W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926, pp. 189-190. The Apocalypse of John, in fact, took over the examples mentioned and incorporated them into his work, cf. Apoc. of John 6:9-11; 7:9-17; 20:4-6.

persecution of the heathen surroundings, is embodied in Daniel in the lion's den (Daniel 6:24) in the trustworthy God."[101] During the troubled times of the Jewish nation, devastated under the singeing power of Rome, the emphasis of faith became increasingly tied with endurance and steadfastness to things Jewish. This stance was intimately tied to the disastrous times of persecution and destruction of the Jewish hopes of nationhood.

The similarities evidenced by a comparison of these Jewish thoughts with those of John, in particular his farewell discourse, are striking. The general tenor of such thinking is at the base of the johannine discussion as well. What it means to be a disciple of Jesus, as shown in the farewell discourse, can best be described by using terms similar to those employed during the intertestamental period, such as faithfulness, loyalty, steadfastness and endurance. John utilizes such motifs as endurance (16:1) and steadfastness (see the discussion on "keeping the commandment," "remain in me," and the more complex issue of the elect versus the world), and even includes the hope of joy which awaits those who do endure.[102] Since John is concerned with such an emphasis, he does not develop neat confessions or elaborate dogmas to relate the content of faith. To be sure, Käsemann has given a corrective to Bultmann's one-sided reconstruction of John which insists that there is no interest whatsoever in confession or dogma.[103] There are certainly premises of faith which the believer holds.[104] Yet, the emphasis in John's farewell address is placed on the steadfastness of the believer to the covenant, and that means to the community of faith of which he is a part.

---

[101] Meyer, *Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes*, p. 124. Other examples supporting this supposition include: I Maccabees 2:59-62, and the three men in the fiery oven; Wisdom of Ben Sirach 2:1-14, where the appeal is for steadfastness to the God who saves in time of affliction and where faith is bound to ὑπομονή as well; Wisdom of Solomon 3, 4:6, 9 where the emphasis is upon endurance through the testing of persecution. Likewise, the Rabbinic sources stress the same point, often in reference to Habakkuk 2:4 (p. 130), e.g., Tanchuma Buber 10, p. 16b; Makkoth 23b; Mechilta to Ex. 15:1; Schemoth r. 23 (As quoted in Meyer, p. 131).

Given such an emphasis on steadfastness, it is necessary to reiterate that this stance of the individual is directed to the community, and not to mere dogmas about Christ. Bultmann is correct, in one sense, in arguing that what we have in belief here is not a general ethical principle subsumed to which man is to place his whole life, and thus a principle which can be separated from the ground and context of that insight. If such were the case, he argues, the relation to the revealer would be destroyed and man would no longer need the revealer but would have things in his own hand.[105] However, even that misrepresents the case, for the problem of John's community is precisely the fact that the Messiah has departed, and the community itself is the only abiding evidence that faith is well grounded. The united actions of its members supports each individual. In the persecution situation such communal affirmation would send the persecuted one to his experience "impelled by the dramatic representation of a gloriously accomplished victory."[106] Communal encouragement was essential in the confrontation of satanic powers which were everywhere present to the persecuted. Steadfastness to the community--the community which on the one hand preserves the traditions about the revealer and on the other hand stands isolated against the hostile world and which must survive unto itself--and, therefore, steadfastness to Christ, means just action toward one's brothers and endurance with them in preserving the covenant. It is in such a context that the appropriation of Schweizer's suggestion is possible that to follow Jesus and to believe Jesus are interchangeable terms for John.[107] Expressed a bit differently, that is to say with Suiss that the following (Nachfolge) and the imitation (Verähnlichung) of Jesus belong together.[108]

---

[102] That this is only a trend must be stressed, for the period under discussion was a very heterogeneous time in which there were many different responses made to the situations, e.g., one need only note the obvious dichotomy among the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the many other sects to see the point.

For discussions of intertestamental Judaism in this respect, cf. Adolf Schlatter, Der Glaube im Neuen Testament, pp. 17ff; W. Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums, pp. 190ff; and Rudolf Bultmann and Artur Weiser, Faith, pp. 43ff.

[103] Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 405.

[104] Käsemann, Jesu letzter Wille, p. 48, shows that there are rudiments of dogmatic considerations contained in the confession that Jesus is the one sent by God.

---

[105] Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 403. In his article on the eschatology of John ("Die Eschatologie des Johannes-Evangeliums," Glauben und Verstehen, Vol. 1, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964) he bluntly asserts that faith is not an ethic but the deed of the obedience of faith. This fails to apprehend the essential covenantal relationships of the community and the fact that it is only there that faith comes to expression and can be authenticated in act. Bultmann's use of the term ethic is too narrowly conceived on the one hand, and on the other hand he does not see the significance of the isolation of the communal group which is attempting to be true to itself, the elect, which is to be true to God. All depends on the grace found within the community which is the transmitter of hope.

[106] Riddle, The Martyrs, p. 53.

The one thing which characterizes John's understanding of faithfulness is its connection to the concrete situation of the community of faith. Faith is not in a dogmatic vacuum for John; it is not individual piety dealing with ultimates. On the contrary, it is a very practical matter. Ebeling has provided a general insight into the nature of the synoptic gospels' understanding of faith, and two of the concluding points in his article on "Jesus and Faith" are salient to John's understanding as well. They are the observations that (1) "faith takes place in the encounter with other men," and (2) "faith is concrete faith in its being related to a concrete situation."[109] These points conclude that faith, belief, and one may add discipleship, are very practical concerns, concerns which deal with everydayness (*Alltäglichkeit*). These qualities of faith are exhibited in the situation of the johannine community. The matters of life and death are tied up with the covenant and its promises, and the community which *is* that covenant. Faithfulness is only faith if it is so in action.[110] For John, all faith comes to expression in the covenant community, that group which passes on the traditions of the revealer and that body which continues to follow the revealer in corporate response against the hostile world. Man hears and decides for God in the church,[111] and it is his steadfastness to that community, past, present, and future, which is the observable verfication of his faithfulness. Therefore, in the time of crisis at hand, which is the context for the johannine witness of faith, the supreme example of dying for and on behalf of that

---

[107] E. Schweizer, "Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church," NTS 2 (1955-56), p. 91.

[108] T. Suiss, "Nachfolge Jesu," ThL 78 (1953), Col. 131. The full statement here is: "Jesu Ethik ist Ethik der Nachfolge und eben damit Ethik der Verähnlichung mit Jesus; Ethik der Gleichgestaltung in der Nachfolge."

[109] G. Ebeling, "Jesus and Faith," Word and Faith, translated by James W. Leitch, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963, pp. 243-244. His other four concluding points

---

(pp. 240-245) as to the nature of faith do, in fact, also play a role in the total johannine picture of faith; i.e., (1) faith gives certainty to existence, (2) faith is directed toward the future, (3) faith is power, (4) faith is always saving faith. All of these considerations fit well with the concrete situation of faith as has been outlined in the second chapter of this dissertation.

[110] As Faulhaber has convincingly argued: "Faith is always action, a bold venture of the deed," which is to say as well "the knowledge of God is always right action (rechtes Handeln)." (*Das Johannesevangelium*, pp. 32 and 56 respectively). It is not an overstatement to contend that the reason John has always verbalized this word (πιστεύειν) and has never used it in a noun form, as a "thing," is due to the *active* quality of faithfulness.

[111] *Ibid*., p. 53.

community becomes the highest expression of such faithfulness. A death wish is not at the base of such an expression. On the contrary, it is existence within the secular, earthly context which is lived in total response to one's fellows. Only here is God, who has never been seen by any men (1:18), known: through the traditions and brotherhood of the elect.

Such a context provides the clue to the johannine depiction of what it means to know God.[112] Knowledge of God cannot be isolated from belief. Bultmann has summarized John's use of γινώσκειν well:

> As in the Old Testament it is not a knowledge of God's eternal essence, but knowledge of his claim. The knowledge of God (Hos. 4:1; 6:6), or 'knowledge' in the absolute (Hos. 4:6; Pro. 1:7) is almost identical with the fear of God with which it is linked in Isaiah 11:2, and it implies the doing of what is right and just (Jeremiah 22:16).[113]
>
> In John it is a mutual relationship. But it is obvious that materially this is understood to be agape. To be determined by love is thus a criterion of the knowledge of God, as also of belonging to Jesus (13:35). Observing the commandments (which have agape as their content) might also be called a criterion of γινώσκειν.[114]

This same conclusion is evidenced in Faulhaber's contention that for John "knowledge is not gnosis . . . but a deed."[115]

---

[112] The significance of γινώσκειν is expressed well by Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. 2, pp. 73ff., C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 151-169. Cf. Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, pp. 290f.; 333f.; 469f., and "γινώσκω" in Kittel TDNT, Vol. 1, pp. 689-719.

[113] Bultmann, Johannes-Evangelium, p. 695.

[114] Ibid., p. 711.

[115] Faulhaber, Das Johannesevangelium, p. 56. Corell argues similarly in drawing upon the Old Testament understanding of yada' as including the whole personality: "It is an

Faith, which is faithfulness, and knowledge are not to be associated with intellectual assent, but are rather active participation in concrete events in life. Such a relationship is developed by John in order to illustrate what is expected of those who claim belief; it relates what genuine belief entails.[116] In the johannine context of the farewell discourse, the call of belief is agape toward one's brother, unto death.

D. John's Persecution Ethic

The analysis thus far has attempted to explore two matters: It first of all sought to show that John may properly be classified as persecution literature (chapter two) and it then sought to delve into the subject matter of certain characteristic themes which demonstrate the exhortatory response of the author to the persecution situation (chapter three, part one). It remains for the analysis to set forth in bolder relief what can be termed the persecution ethic of the fourth gospel.

The persecution has been the impetus for the writing. Faced with adversity, the evangelist writes to the community to comfort it and to exhort it to faithfulness. His words:

---

ethical concept and is used to express man's knowledge of God as well as God's knowledge of man." (Consummatum est, p. 138.)

[116] It is not, for example, a mere assertion of the mind and not that of the action of the total person, as John 16:29 shows.

1) tell of the persecution both of Jesus and his disciples, and 2) call for a positive response to the present events of persecution which are similar to those of Jesus.

At the heart of the situation stands the plight of the disciples in a world which is still ruled by Satan and his friends. The basic question which underlies the farewell discourse is: why must the elect continue to suffer in this world if the departed Jesus is indeed Lord and Savior, the Messiah? The theological setting for the confrontation of such a question is that of a cosmological dualism. Although Satan and his forces have conquered the Lord in these days and have crucified him, Jesus is said to have spoken beforehand concerning that event and had said that precisely because of that crucifixion he would be glorified by the Father. Once glorified, he would prepare a place for his disciples as well, a place where they would one time abide.

The _theologia crucis_ is the question which lies immediately behind John's presentation in the farewell and passion accounts. Although couched in the evangelist's own comprehension of that event as _theologia gloriae_, the tensions of faith are everywhere present in the section. Christ died at the hand of the evil powers here on earth and the expected parousia has not occurred but still lies in the future. So, the question must be answered: is there hope at all? And, if the community can still be led to hope--in a time when believing at all leads to the possibility of annihilation--what is an adequate way of expressing such hope?

The community is told that Christ has been glorified and that the members of the elect participate in the glorification in so far as they remain steadfast and remember the promises of the savior. Christ's victory over the evil powers is also the disciples' victory, if they too survive the threats and injuries of those same powers as Jesus did. In turn, one survives those threats and dangers if one takes seriously the covenant and the community bearing that covenantal promise. The demand, as it is elaborated in the farewell discourse, is that the members remain faithful in the covenantal context. Such a stance alone fortifies the faithful in the time of the absence of the Lord for the elect community is the visible sign that Jesus has been glorified.

Each member is faithful in so far as he continues to live with reference to the community, and it is in this relationship that the term persecution ethic is a proper one. One's support for his brother continues the community as God's covenant and this provides its own verification of the faith exhibited. The ethic is a call for brother support in light of persecution. As such it is an ethic which finds its total concern with those who already participate within the covenantal understanding of life and grace. There is no missionary zeal (although it is obvious that there is no attempt to exclude outsiders); the present fear of persecution presses in to nullify that concern. The business, contrariwise, turns to the endurance of the faithful and the call for support of those who do endure. Brother-love is one key to the johannine ethic as that stands in conjunction with the command to keep the commandments.

Bearing on the perilous times and the anxiety over the justification of faith is the paradigm of Christ as he washed the feet of the disciples and as he spoke of his own action in laying down one's life for one's friends. The christology of the farewell discourse serves to reassure faith in the departed one (seen in the recollection of promises and prophecies found there) and it stands in the service of the life and action of the disciples at the end of the first century as they attempt to confront the perils of their time. By giving of themselves to their brothers in faithfulness, the followers of Christ show themselves to be worthy of the promises made to them by Jesus. The cosmic sign of their victory is not visible. Assurance is given only in the gift of the Paraclete and the visible presence of the covenant community itself. The redeemer is absent; the community stands as the bulwark of the faith. In the faithfulness of the members of that covenant to one another is to be found the worthy few, the elect from the cosmos.

The context of the ethic is provided by the total passion scene and the intimate imagery of chapter 15 with its climax in verse 13. Such a frame suggests that the forebearance and steadfastness envisioned in this ethic carries just as far as the action of Christ, even to a martyr's death; a death on behalf of one's own. The principles of faith, if one may speak of such at all, are brought to light only in one's life within the community and in one's faithfulness to that group. John does not exhibit a theology or christology for the theoretical value of such inquiry here. On the contrary, he proposes an ethic which includes references to a christology and theology because they are helpful in answering to the question of survival itself among those who have already made a faith stand. The farewell discourse pictures Christ as the friend who died on behalf of his own, and that is precisely what is now demanded of his followers if they are to persevere in steadfastness and faithfulness to the covenantal promises. John understands the covenant as a relation between men which verifies revelation. Such a relation brings life in that revelation. Its martyr's death was in service to his own, which shows that he remained faithful to the end. The persecution ethic demands no less a sacrifice if need be. The items discussed earlier in this chapter (keeping the commandment, loving one another, bearing fruit, remaining in Christ) find their referent in the passion of Jesus, even if that passion has been transformed into a _theologia gloriae_. The answer to the issues of faith for the johannine community lie in that event and its result, and in that event lies the hope which the evangelist portrays. And that, it might be said further, lies in a question of theodicy: how can one continue to speak of the justice of God given the fact that the glorified one has not returned and given the situation of persecution which is driving God's very chosen ones into despair and possible loss of earthly life?

John answers the theodicy question by pointing the community back upon itself. Its very survival in faithfulness to the covenant made with God through Christ is the verification of God's justice. Therefore, the issue to worry about is how one responds within the community so as to preserve its integrity; and that is done by faithfulness and fidelity to one another in agape.

E. The Persecution Ethic of John and Contemporary Scholarship

In the interpretation of the johannine gospel, the method of correlation is a necessary methodological tool. John's gospel is occasional literature, written with specific, practical interests in view. Therefore, the communal situation is a vital part of the gospel, not simply an external factor. Chapter two attempted to reconstruct the situation and occasion with which the gospel is in dialogue. The third chapter sought to re-evaluate certain exhortatory themes in light of those conclusions. The result: John's intent in the farewell discourse was to exhort and to bolster the faithfulness of a community which faced persecution.

The failure of previous studies on the johannine ethic, as surveyed in chapter one, lies in the fact that they did not take seriously the situation of the community and the questions posed by that situation. Each of those studies sought to derive the johannine ethic from a theological basis. They failed to consider that the dogmatic reflections in John stand in the service of his exhortation to the community, exhortation necessitated by the propitious situation. They attempted to construct the johannine ethic from general johannine theological norms but in doing so they disregarded John as occasional literature and failed to attend to the importance of literary form in helping to reconstruct John's interest. Because of an inadequate methodological approach to the gospel, those researchers comprehended John's ethic inadequately. The present study has attempted to overcome that error by attending to the historical situation and the literary form of the gospel.

7

CHAPTER IV

JOHN'S GOSPEL AND OTHER PERSECUTION LITERATURE

A. John in the Development of Persecution Literature

The analysis of the farewell discourse in the Gospel of John has demonstrated that John addressed a community beset by persecution and hostility. Chapter 2 indicated the evangelist's concern for faithfulness in the period of crisis through the "recollection" of Jesus' departing words on the demands of discipleship. Cast in a dualistic framework of elect community versus the satanic powers of the world, the discourse proceeds from issues held in common with apocalyptic. The underlying issue in the discourse is why the elect suffer even though the Messiah has come. John responds to the problem of the absence of the Lord by turning that problem into the positive key: the community, under the guidance of the Spirit, is witness to the glorification of Jesus which is, in turn, assurance that the elect will have a just end.

Within this framework, the exhortatory themes call attention to the intra-communal interest of the evangelist. He speaks to the elect group. His interest is to instruct the community so it will stand firm as it faces the perils from without. This concern, ethically conceived, is expressed in the theologia crucis presented as theologia gloriae: the faithfulness of brother to brother, even to death, leads to glorification. By such faithful action each witnesses to the claims concerning the departed Lord.

To contend that John's farewell address, as central to the interpretation of the gospel, is written to provide an ethic for a persecution situation is to suggest, as well, that the Fourth Gospel is a part of the development of persecution literature generally.[1] In attempting to interpret John's gospel in light of persecution literature broadly conceived, two different types of sources are available for consideration. First is the literature which comes from Jewish sources of the Maccabean and post-Maccabean periods. Heavily influenced by an apocalyptic outlook, these writings reveal the background and cultural context from which John's conceptualization and understanding undoubtedly grew.[2] A second general source is the persecution literature of the Christians as it flourished in the third and fourth centuries, as well as in the second century. This martyrological literature exhibits the special communal concerns of the persecuted Christians and by analogy it is legitimate to study the earlier Christian literature with those special concerns and expressions in mind in order to see if the early literature responds to similar issues.[3] It is important that the method of analogy being employed be kept in view so that the conclusions reached are not given more value than they deserve; however, it is certainly legitimate to argue, within bounds, that similar expressions, conclusions, and questions come from similar causes and contexts.[4] Riddle has applied the analogical methodology adeptly to his study of the martyrological and New Testament literature and this chapter deals with a similar methodology in the study of I Peter and its proximity to John's gospel.

---

[1] W. H. C. Frend's book, Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church, Garden City, N. Y: Doubleday and Company, 1967, is a noteworthy attempt at giving a historical survey of persecution from the time of the Maccabees to the time of Donatus. Although immensely helpful in the vast quantity of material it discusses, its interests by-pass the problem of ethics and the social attitudes among the persecuted groups. The value of Riddle's book, The Martyrs, is that he does attempt such an analysis. Frend's book replaces the older study of H. B. Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, London: The Epworth Press, 1906. Workman began with the period of the early church and thus gave no heed to the intertestamental Jewish influences on the understanding of events in the early church.

[2] Surkau, Martyrien; Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus; and Frend, Martyrdom and Persecution provide excellent insights into the martyr models which developed in this period and their subsequent influence in Christian literature.

---

[3] Riddle, _The Martyrs_, has done this analogical study quite astutely, but also quite fairly. He does not obviously claim more for the analogies drawn than is justified.

Literature which is particularly important for such consideration is surveyed in J. Quasten, _Patrology_, Vol. 1, Westminster, Md: The Newman Press, esp. "The First Acts of the Martyrs," pp. 176-185; Riddle, _The Martyrs_; Frend, _Martyrdom and Persecution_; D. Attwater, _Martyrs from St. Stephen to John Tung_, London: Sheed and Ward, 1958.

[4] One problem with Hare's work on _Jewish Persecution of Christians_ is his failure to observe this. His rigidity in depending on explicit Jewish texts for setting up his thesis, with little regard for Christian works because of their suspect prejudice, forces the interpretation of the varied literature too much. His conclusions are actually dependent upon the reliability and completeness of Jewish texts, which also had their particular bent. Such analysis is too restrictive. Stephen, for example, was viewed as the protomartyr for Christians in the second century (Frend, _Martyrdom and Persecution_, p. 63), yet his persecution is not indicated in any Jewish document. So, by inference, Hare concludes that this incident was localized and must not be taken as exemplary of general Jewish action. Certainly the prejudice of Christian literature must be scrutinized, but this should not

The analysis to follow is intended to give not exacting parallels to the persecution ethic of John, but to demonstrate that there are many common features which appear to stem from similar questions asked in persecution contexts. The brief sketches on Enoch and I Peter help to place the johannine farewell discourse in broader perspective and to bolster the feasibility of the conclusions reached concerning John's intent.

B. Enoch 91-105

Enoch exemplifies the broader cultural milieu with which John appears to have considerable affinity.[5] This self-standing section of Enoch is constructed in the form of a farewell discourse. Although this section has obviously been

---

prohibit its usefulness in the study of persecution. Indeed, it could be argued that occasional literature such as John or I Peter reflects better the tenor and actual anxiety of the times than does that dealing with "strictly" legal or historical matters.

[5] Enoch 91-105 is taken as representative of much intertestamental literature to which a similar analysis could be applied. Other literature, such as the collection of the Dead Sea Scrolls, could be looked at from this stance. As well, much of the remainder of Enoch could be studied, but 91-105 was selected because of the farewell discourse form which forms this self-standing unit.

composed from several different sources,[6] the thrust it discloses appears to be a single one. It calls for a steadfastness on the part of the "brothers," the sacred community, to await patiently and with hope the coming judgment of the lord (99:10).

The author has employed the Apocalypse of Weeks (93:1-14; 91:12-17) to delineate the schema of righteousness-apostasy and unrighteousness on the earth--and the anticipated consummation and victory of righteousness (91:17). The time of writing appears to be that of the seventh week in which apostasy is the key word for the acts being perpetrated toward God's people.[7] The revelation, however, looks to the future weeks in which judgment will come and finally bring victory for the faithful.

---

[6] Most scholars argue, for example, that the Apocalypse of Weeks is the oldest material of this section and precedes the period of the Maccabeans. Since the appearance of the ten weeks is now out of order, the rearrangement is made: 93:1-10; 91:13-17 as the original order of the apocalypse. Cf. R. Charles, "I Enoch," Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. 2, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913, p. 170. Charles contends further that 91:2; 93:11-14; and 96:2 are interpolations of a later date (Ibid., p. 261). Volz argues in Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, p. 18, that four insolatable pieces of material make up the composition of 91-104, including 1) 91:1-10; 2) the Apocalypse of Weeks, 3) 92:1ff.; 94:1-102:3; and 4) 102:4-104.

The complexity of the composition problem does not need to deter from the use of this section here for, as Oesterley has stated, "The concluding section of the book (through 105) is a complete, though short, work." (Introduction to The Book of Enoch, R. H. Charles, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1893, p. xxv.)

[7] The writer seems to be writing, from his standpoint, at the end of the seventh week. His elaborate discussions concerning the sinful generation of apostates and its acts suggest that period. Certainly the righteous do not yet have the sword promised in the eighth week with which to execute judgment on the oppressors (91:12).

The literary form of the farewell discourse accords well with the intention of bringing to the fore exhortation aimed at encouragement, at faithfulness, and at proper living in the expectancy of the last days.

For the presentation of the author, the dichotomy which exists between the "children of heaven" (101:1) and the "children of earth" (102:3) has been taken as the basic point of confrontation. Although the document supposes that all parties were part of the covenant, it attempts to show that many have become apostate and only a few remain who are faithful. It is an intra-Jewish document and one not directed to heathen. Only a few remain privy to the wisdom afforded in the sacred books of wisdom and doctrine. The faithful are pictured as the few who are faced with the prospect of perishing at the hand of the unrighteous. Indeed, the whole section is aimed at overcoming the fear of persecution. That this section of Enoch is persecution literature has been the scholarly consensus,[8] and is supported by a host of references:

---

[8] Although the consensus clearly points to a time of persecution, the time of the writing and the persons being persecuted are much more difficult to determine. A majority of scholars hold that the persecution took place under Alexander Jannaeus after 96 B.C. The work shows, so Torrey contends, that the prince and people were hopelessly at enmity "and that 'the blood of the righteous' (97:2) was being shed in ever increasing flow." (C. C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, London: Oxford University Press, 1945, p. 211.) Jannaeus fought with mercenaries against his own people "while in particular he instituted a wholesale slaughter of

> 91:5 Violence must increase on earth and all righteousness come to an end and its whole structure be destroyed.
>
> 95:7 Woe to you sinners for you persecute the righteous.
>
> 96:3 Fear not you that have suffered for healing shall be your portion.
>
> 96:8 Woe to you mighty who oppress the righteous with might for your day of destruction is coming.

---

the Parisees. It was in the atmosphere of such scenes that the author of the book saw the Day of Judgment at hand." (Torrey, "Alexander Jannaeus and the Archangel Michael," *VT* 4 (1954), p. 210.) In addition, Kaplan, Charles, Hughes, and Beer agree with Torrey's general conclusion. Since the court and those in agreement with the established powers were laying a heavy hand on the writer and readers of Enoch 91-105 they are presumed to be Sadducees.

Adam Welch argues that this part of the book was written by and for Zealots. There is certainly persecution, but since there is no messiah and no resurrection there is an emphasis on the law and the temple, and the readers are led to believe that they will initiate the kingdom themselves. Welch contends that the spirit of the writing is really inspired by the Zealots' outlook, such Zealots who were being persecuted by the established powers.

Oesterley takes yet another route. Since the period under discussion--roughly the same as that proposed by Torrey--was quite diverse and eclectic with regard to religious belief and practices, Oesterley contends that it is not necessary to say that all the literature of this period was either Pharisaic or Sudducean and that ". . . it seems probable that the bulk of this book was written by apocalypticists who belonged neither to Pharisaic or yet to Sadducean circles." (W. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, New York: R. H. Revell Co., 1914, p. 206.)

One who does not follow the consensus that this is persecution literature is Dillman. Dillman thinks that the book, of Pharisaic origin, is authored during a time of peace and not during a time of stress or war. Its purpose, he argues, is too large for that restricted purpose. Its intention is that of developing the biblical-ethical faith in a number of ways; an attempt which could not be well approached in a time of crisis. (A. Dillman, *Das Buch Henoch*, Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1853, p. xlvi.)

> 99:15-16 Woe to them who work unrighteousness and help oppression, and slay their neighbors until the day of the great judgment. For he will cast down your glory.
>
> 100:7 Woe to you sinners on the day of strong anguish: Ye who afflict the righteous and burn them with fire.
>
> 102:4 Fear not ye souls of the righteous and be hopeful ye that have died in righteousness.
>
> 103:12 The unrighteous have hated us and smote us
> We have found no place to flee and be safe from them.
> They devoured us even though we cried to them.
> And they helped those who robbed us and devoured us, and made us few.
> (They) did not remove the yoke of those devouring, dispersing, and murdering us and they concealed their murder.

These specific references, added to the general frame of the last discourse and the tenor of writing--which is certainly a subjective criterion, but one which does not need to be dismissed out of hand as of no consequence--all reflect the situation of persecution. It is, as always, difficult to determine whether the apocalyptic battle theme of children of light against the children of darkness is merely a literary creation unrelated to actual events, or whether the historical setting demands an apocalyptic frame in order to be comprehensible to the gathered, suffering community. As with John, the latter alternative seems more attractive here because of the way the dichotomy of the two groups has been arranged: the rich oppress, the idolaters oppress, the mighty and powerful oppress--these terms could very well represent several diverse groups which are all characterized as the "children of the earth." The scenes described likely represent various factors which are pressing in on the addressed community and which appear to be forcing it into oblivion and death. It is not necessarily one systematic persecution opposing the righteous, but several thrusts of the hostile world forcing the picture of the final dualism of the faithful community against the oppressing cosmos.

This farewell discourse is addressed to the community of believers as it attempts to struggle for life in an hostile environment, and it is a call for positive living within the covenant community; one might say it presents a persecution ethic. The covenant is given meaning and transmitted by Enoch to the followers. Immediately after he has called his sons together the Apocalypse of Weeks is introduced. In that old material is presented the Heilsgeschichte of the community, which is to say that here the community's place in history is presented: the people are reminded of their role in history. They are far down the chronological line from the initiation of the covenant, but they are not far from the end of the consumation and final victory of those who have been true bearers of the covenantal promises. The first heaven is about to pass away and the new heaven of righteousness--where those who are now righteous, i.e., bearers of the covenant, will dwell victorious--is about to dawn (91:16). The elect community is to have its reward, but the unrighteous, those untrue to the covenant of the fathers, will depart to Sheol never to rise again.

In light of the covenant history, the Apocalypse of Weeks, the farewell discourse of Enoch 91-105 is a call for continued faithfulness in the face of the most grim and horrible realities surrounding the community. Murder, fire, dispersion, robbery, devouring, torture, all are at hand for the elect; but the call is: The angels remember the righteous. Be hopeful, do not cast away your hope (104:1-3). Fear not the growing strength of the sinners (104:6). Let not your spirit be troubled on account of the times (92:3). Be hopeful ye righteous (96:1). Believe ye righteous that the sinners will become a sham and perish (97:1). Ye shall have peace: rejoice, ye children of uprightness (105:2). Encouragement in the face of total discouragement is brought by the superior knowledge, wisdom, and sacred books with which Enoch is acquainted and the contents of which he reveals to the hearers (cf. 103:2; 104:12-13; 99:10). Such wisdom reveals that indeed, contrary to appearances and the convictions of sinners, not all men do die similar deaths.[9] All die, to be sure, but for the covenant community death is a victory, for in death their reward is given to them.

The secret knowledge of the discourse of Enoch encourages the community to believe that their faithfulness is worthwhile and justified. In addition, it is contended that death, even a martyr's death, has its merit and efficacy.

---

[9] Contrary to the thought of some; e.g., Enoch 102:6-8.

The author has been mythopoeic to the extent that he has taken an experience facing the covenant group in the midst of persecution and has mythologized and cosmologized that experience so as to make the event meaningful and bearable. The construction of the myth itself, which is both a conscious and subconscious development, ties in with the people's history and it allows one of its own forebears to speak in the person of Enoch. It takes the covenant experience of the people as the unifying theme, with the covenant itself being the promise still to be fulfilled. To this feature is added the cosmologization of the present experience of hardship and persecution so that such an event might be viewed as part of the covenant plan itself. Hence, the Apocalypse of Weeks finds its place in the structure of the mythic story.

Given such a mythopoeic construction, there abides the common covenantal experience of this group, from whatever particular group within Judaism it might be. It is that community which must decide how to live in the portentious times: it must decide it is worthy to die in faithfulness and righteousness or that such persecution is meaningless and the covenant itself devoid of meaning. Enoch's testament is an appeal to steadfastness to the covenant in a time of the absence of God. In so far as it is an appeal to faithfulness to the covenant, it is likewise an appeal to a covenantal, persecution ethic. This ethic calls its adherents to live righteous lives. Righteousness here means something very similar to the Hebraic understanding of righteousness as a proper relationship to God which is, in fact, a proper relationship to one's neighbor.[10] Since the covenantal members have such a calling to be righteous before God, this makes a division between the elect and the apostate inevitable. The paths of violence and wickedness are opposed to the paths of righteousness (91:19; 94:3) and since the elect must not walk the evil ways, they must separate themselves from those that do:[11] "Beloved: Love uprightness and walk therein. Associate not with those of a double heart (91:3)." "Blessed are those who become not godless with the godless (99:10)." A persecution ethic in Enoch's comprehension is one in which a man stands righteous in the covenant. Such a man stands with and for his neighbor in that covenant. What this means concretely for Enoch is more difficult to say. One of the seeming characteristics of a persecution ethic exhorted in response to harsh circumstances is such a lack of "specific" requirements.[12] In the case of the Gospel of John, such a lack aids in advancing the heavy emphasis given to the death of the covenant participants on behalf of their neighbors. In Enoch the meaning is very similar even though couched in different terms. There, what it means to be righteous is largely to be extrapolated from the negative "woes," signs which show that such persons have no regard for the covenant. They requite the neighbor with evil, persecute covenant members, use might for power's sake, slay the neighbor. To be righteous is to stand firm on Jahweh's side, not wavering, and to die, if need be, by oppression. The persecution ethic is tied to the enduring hope and trustworthiness of the members to each other as they uphold and affirm the promise given with the covenant. As such, it is not an individualistic ethic in which each man can stand alone as the bearer of the covenant promise; rather, the community itself is responsible as a group for standing firm in the covenantal promise if any man is to stand.

---

[10] See the excellent discussion of this hebraic understanding in Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker, New York: Harper and Row, pp. 380ff.

[11] Given such a world view as this it is important to note that action and being, the person and his act, cannot be separated. A man is what his action shows him to be. The intention here is for covenant preservation unharmed by contacts with the covenantless. If the sinner is to be saved he must come to the elect group and seek them out, not the other way around.

[12] The "specific" action of persecution ethics deals directly with the response to persecution and is not concerned with actions apart from that referent.

The affinities of the johannine persecution ethic to the religio-cultural questions besetting the community addressed by Enoch are striking: the intra-communal exclusivism; the dualistic framework of the elect community persecuted by the apostate community; the victory of the righteous which is given in death; the exhortation to faithfulness which is founded in superior knowledge, wisdom, and the sacred books which Enoch possesses--as compared to the superior knowledge and revelation which Jesus brings; and the call for steadfastness in spite of the strength and hostility of the outsiders.

Yet, the differences are also apparent. The project of Enoch is presented with much more interest in the salvation history of the people Israel. The people have a large role in the sacred history and by their righteousness and faithfulness they participate in bringing about the new heaven. There is salvation history in John, in so far as Jesus is the Messiah who completes the expectation of Jewish Christians. He initiates a new aeon. Yet, there is a certain discontinuity with the past history, or better, a certain lack of interest in that history even though it is the historical presupposition upon which John builds his appeal. Another distinction between Enoch and John is the passion theme itself. Enoch's presentation has no one model such as the Messiah upon which the work is centered, as in John. Perhaps as a result of this, Enoch places emphasis on the retribution theme. The "woes" pronounced upon the apostates bolster the faithful in their own actions. John, however, does not sustain his readers by a condemnation of the world in such explicit terms. He speaks of the responsibility for faithfulness within the community in light of the passion of Jesus and that passion guides the faithful.

Even though there are significant differences between these two writings, such differences also help to delineate the common elements of the persecution ethic of both.

C. *I Peter*

Affinities with John's persecution ethic are found also in I Peter. In all probability, this letter exemplifies persecution literature.[13] All parts of the book point to the validity of such a supposition, including the following isolatable intimations:

---

[13] To be sure this is still a highly contended thesis. Generally, it may be said that one of two views is taken concerning I Peter: 1. that it is persecution literature or 2. it is a baptismal treatise with an appendix which might be taken as a persecution letter written at a different time from the main body of the letter.

Beare attempts to demonstrate that I Peter is a baptismal sermon with a second letter aimed at a present persecution situation now attached to the first (Others who hold to this thesis include: Crose, Perdelwitz, Bornemann, Streeter, Windisch, Moule, F. Hauck). Beare contends that only at 4:12 is there evidence of a change to a letter speaking to an actually persecuted group. Prior to that the letter is speaking to a newly baptized group with talk of *possible* suffering, and there it is brought up only because it relates to Christian life generally (F. C. Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter*, revised edition, Oxford: Blackwell's, 1947, pp. 6ff.). Cross, upon whom Beare is dependent, thinks that I Peter is set in a time of a Paschal Vigil at the time of Easter and is "the Baptismal rite of Easter, the most solemn act of liturgical worship in the year" (*I Peter. A Paschal Liturgy*, London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1954, p. 38). Thus, it is a baptismal liturgy which has been worked into a letter form. He attempts to recreate the liturgical text which forms the body of the letter. His analysis is incomplete (and therefore distorted) because he is unable to account for the purpose of 4:12ff. and because he cannot explain why the liturgy has been rewritten as a letter.

On the other hand, scholars such as Nauck, Lohse, and van Unnik contend that the general purpose of the letter--not two letters, but one--is that of strengthening and supporting those who are undergoing suffering and persecution. Set within an apocalyptic (so Nauck, "Freude im Leiden," *ZNW* 46 (1955), p. 77) frame, the πειρασμος of faith is upon the followers of Christ and the battlefield is set between the prince of darkness and the pious and elect (*Ibid.*). All three of these researchers contend that the entire letter points not to a possible danger but to the fact that the whole situation of the addressed community is beset with danger; hence, the exhortatory use of the suffering of Christ as a model of action. Even if the first part of the letter was at one stage a baptismal discourse, it has now become transposed into an aid in interpreting the holocaustic times faced by the community.

1:6 = a reference to possible trials which cause deep concern.

1:7 = a statement that trials of persecution (testing) are near.

3:13ff. = a reference to testing which will show steadfastness to the faith.

4:12 = the ordeal which they are suffering (present tense) gives the people a part in Christ's own bodily suffering.

4:17 = the last judgment is beginning (present tense) with God's own household.

5:8 = the devil is prowling, looking for someone to devour.

5:9 = an intimation that brother Christians are going through the same kinds of suffering.

5:10 = after the brief sufferings now the Christians are promised that God will restore, establish and strengthen them.

These references are strong indicators that a persecution situation is prominently on the mind of the author. Such texts are, moreover, supported in their persecution setting by the general context of the letter. As with the Gospel of John, it is instructive to note that the letter itself appears to be an appeal for steadfastness of faith. The letter serves an exhortatory function rather than a dogmatic one. It is all the more important, therefore, to see that the central christological motif involved here is that of Christ's passion and death, and the resurrection. One of the strong emphases here is the example of Christ as the martyr (2:21-22; 3:18; 4:1ff.). Although the communal members have never seen Christ (1:8), they are assured that if they trust through the perilous times their harvest of faith will be salvation. The ordeals of faith--the hostility of the world against them, which must be thought of in terms of persecution--make them participants in Christ's sufferings and that sets them apart from glorification just as Christ was glorified through undeserved suffering.

Those who would make a strong case for a partition of the letter into two letters (1:1-4:11 and 4:12-5:14) often view the first part as a baptismal sermon and only the second part is viewed as a letter written to a persecution situation. The first part, accordingly, refers only to possible trials which the baptized initiates in the faith are likely to encounter. However, such a distinction seems to underplay certain evidence. Those who would divide I Peter in this way take I Peter 1:6, for example, as a reference to possible future events since εἰ δέον states only a possibility. However, even here the connection of the πυρός of 1:7 is a metaphor employed in the context of the supposed "actual" persecution letter of 4:12ff. where πυρώσει is used also to describe conditions. Since the theme of the sufferings of Christ found in I Peter is tied so closely to the persecution motif, it appears that this theme unites the entire epistle in a way which cannot be minimized. Accordingly, even if a baptismal sermon does lie at the heart of the first section it is used in the letter only as a means of showing what faith is demanded of the readers. The baptismal theme of dying-rising (3:21ff., for example) is employed to demonstrate what Christ's suffering has effected: although he died he was resurrected and through that resurrection he has made possible the salvation of the members of faith. The baptismal reflections are subservient to the theme of Christ's sufferings and those sufferings are used as the prime example for people faced with suffering themselves in a hostile world.

Given the persecution back-and-foreground, the author addresses his letter to those who are the bearers of the trying times, namely the elect covenant community. In so doing, he uses the familiar distinctions of the insiders and the outsiders. The world takes on the face of an arena in which the elect are called upon to stand fast in the faith before the world.[3] Already in the greeting of the letter the community is called God's scattered, i.e., exiled, people "who live for awhile in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." The theme of separation is again related in 2:11 where the people are addressed "as aliens in a foreign land." They stand against the world, not just in it.

> But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a dedicated nation, and a people claimed by God for his own, to proclaim the triumphs of him who has called you out of darkness into his marvelous light. (2:9)

As the chosen people, followers of Christ have become the new Israel (You are now the people of God, who once were not his people--2:10) and stand separated in the world. Now they are called to a steadfastness within the context of a persecution ethic. There is no call to become engaged in the activities of the world, there is no demand that they seek to actively change the political or social structures. On the contrary, the exhortations are of a totally different character. Toward the world they are to stand in humility. They are to submit (the emphasis on humility and perserverence is pronounced in this very word) to every human institution (2:13). They are to honor the sovereign, but even that announcement is couched in the outward show of humility for the covenant's sake, not for active support of the programs of the emperor. Although the worst may come from human institutions, they are reassured that nothing can destroy the inheritance which is theirs in heaven, their salvation which will be revealed at the end of time (1:5). The covenant community is called upon to understand itself as a people who will likely encounter suffering, and the expostulated ethic is viewed from this context. Hence the importance given to the theme of Christ and his bodily suffering. Those Christians who suffer from undeserved suffering have their reward--not now but later.

In this confrontation, the community is charged to active, positive response and that is elucidated with reference to their brothers in the faith. It is significant that ἀγάπη is used only in referring to the brotherhood of the elect and not with an interpretation which could be called love for the brother's enemy. The response of love is for the benefit of the elect. The exhortation is made: "love one another, your brother Christians, whole-heartedly with all your strength (1:22); give love to the brotherhood (2:17); keep love for one another (the brotherhood) at full strength (4:8)." Even the appeal to the elders is directed to a similar goal: tend that flock of God whose shepherds you are . . . Then when the head shepherd appears you will receive for your own the unfading garland of glory (5:3-4). The example to be given by the elders to the younger members is that of a humility which would be similar to that of Christ. Christ in his humility died for his own; so, too, is that the calling to which Christians are called: to stand fast against the evil power of Satan and be willing to die, if need be, in behalf of the covenant and its people which are inseparable from the meaning of the covenant. They are to live trustworthily within the elect body. Perhaps, even likely, such action shown among the elect will change the minds of the pagans. But even if not, by remaining firm in the covenant the assurance is proffered that faithfulness to their calling will be rewarded at the end of time and then salvation will be theirs.

Three items taken up in I Peter seem very close to traditional forms of paraenesis, namely the exhortations for servants to accept the authority of their masters (2:18ff.), for women to accept the authority of their husbands (3:1ff.), and for husbands to give due respect to their wives (3:7ff.). These are summed up with the exhortation to "be full of brotherly affection, kindly and humble-minded." But these τόποι[14] are employed to support the general theme of steadfastness and submission in humility. Even the call for the husband to respect his wife is a call for humility instead of arrogant domination. Traditional paraenesis has been used only because it fits well the paracletic function of the letter.[15] The call to the covenant does not carry with it a clarion call for response in kind to the powers that be: "Do not repay wrong with wrong, or abuse with abuse (3:9)." Rather, the call is to stand firm as partakers of the covenant of grace which has its own reward quite apart from the happenings of the world. The call is to stand fast with the brothers in faith, even unto death if need be, and in that stance the victory is assured: ". . . trusting in him now without seeing him, you are transported with a joy too great for words, while you reap the harvest of your faith, that is, salvation for your souls."

The persecution ethic of First Peter, like John and Enoch, is an inner directed ethic. In the perilous circumstances the need was for a bolstering of faith which was both reassuring and demanding. Only hints are given as to what the responsibility was of the member of the elect. But once again it is clear that the demand was to be viewed as total.

---

[14] For a discussion of _topoi_ see the article by David Bradley, "The Topos as a Form in the Pauline Paraenesis," _JBL_ 72 (1953), pp. 238-246.

[15] A use which Furnish has discussed in _Paul's Exhortations in the Context of His Letters and Thought_.

The example was Christ himself who had bodily suffered on behalf of the elect. Should such suffering come to the body it was a clear indicator that they were following the example of their savior. Details seem almost inappropriate in such a context of urgency and confusion. The exhortation is, interestingly, both quite general and yet specific: whereas there is a paucity of concrete suggestions, there remains the demanding prototype of Christ with the repeated emphasis on humility before both the authorities of the world and one's brothers. As with John, the passion of Jesus and his glorification in resurrection are the two events, or one, if one desires to interpret the two words as one, which demand stress, for they (1) show the affinity of Jesus with the persecuted elect and (2) remind the elect of their share in salvation at the end time. Like John, as opposed to Enoch, there is no explicit retaliation declared for the world. No "woes" are needed. The emphasis is directed away from the negative justifying desires and is directed to the accentuation of the life which is possible to the followers of Jesus, even in suffering.

D. Summary of the Analysis

The brief analysis of Enoch and I Peter is not intended to be a full scale exegesis of the material, but is intended to indicate certain similar patterns which seem to issue from these works, especially when they are compared with the Gospel of John. By such a review of the two books and their persecution ethics it seems clear that there is no literary form as such which fits precisely a category of "persecution ethic" in response to a persecution situation. However, it is interesting to note the use of the farewell discourse form as it is used for such ends, for certainly the last discourses of Enoch and John do portray similar intentions.

What the above analysis does tend to support is the observation that persecution literature, i.e., literature which is a response to a persecution from without, responds to questions and issues similarly. It turns inward, upon itself as a piece of writing intended for the select, persecuted group. As such, the rationale for existence and for living ethically are put in restrictive terms. It is literature which strives for preservation of identity and puts its emphasis upon a dualism, a dualism which posits the select members of the inner circle oppressed by the larger number of outcasts of the cosmos as their unrighteous persecutors. Since the very persecution itself is focused upon the peculiarity of the group within the larger cosmos, the ethic exhorted upon the readers of the literature is intended for the preservation of the "covenant and its promises" which stand behind the community. The exhortations call for love of covenant brother which both proves one's own faithfulness to the group and supports others in the group: both facets are indispensable to the integrity of the covenant. Persecution literature attempts to deal, as well, with the problem of the absence or eclipse of God; God is absent, even though his promises of vindication and victory for the elect remain. Because of the absence of God--or of the Savior--a crisis of the justification of faith appears to be the vital question underlying such exhortatory writings. The faithful are called so to live that the community itself will be a spring of the revelation of God. By their presence as a faithful community to the promise of their election they demonstrate that God is still with them and will vindicate their actions. Thus, generally the questions standing behind these writings are apocalyptic in casting: they ask concerning the absence of God and of his final vindication of the righteous and judgment of sinners, which is to say that the question centers on the justification of belief in such times. From such problems issues the question of the faithfulness of the elect to the covenant. Each of the writings examined looks for the time when vindication will come, and in each is envisioned a cosmological struggle which, although going badly for the elect now, will consumate in their victory.

The questions emerging from such study are the vital aspects of the analysis. Generally speaking, there is only sparce consideration given to elongated lists of paraenesis. Yet, even so, the responses expected all make clear the ultimate demand placed upon the believers in their time of crisis. Persecution ethics appear in a variety of writings, in gospels, letters, apocalypses, martyrologies, but their intent is always to exhort and support those communities which are faced with hostile and propitious times.

The study of literature such as Enoch 91-105 and I Peter helps to extend the horizons of John's ethic and helps to demonstrate the cogency of approaching the Gospel of John in the manner attempted in this study. John's ethic is a persecution ethic. It is not unique, although it is of course uniquely John's. It is part of a broader cultural heritage, highly syncretistic, and takes its place in the development of early Christian persecution literature.

CONCLUSION
AND QUESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The results of this study show that John's gospel is situational literature (Kleinliteratur) and is a response to a time of crisis and persecution. The farewell discourse demonstrates this point both in literary form and subject matter. Once the investigator gives heed to the historical circumstances surrounding the gospel, then the exhortations which are present in the farewell discourse are more readily opened to him. Those exhortations help formulate the johannine ethic, which is a persecution ethic. As such it seeks to unify the elect community in its time of crisis and to demonstrate the positive value in dying for one's friends. The concern is an intra-communal one with no regard shown, likely because of the impinging threat from without, for the cosmos or the people in it apart from that group. These concerns place John within the total development of literature directed to communities in persecution contexts, a development in which John stands half-way between the apocalyptically oriented literature of post-Maccabean times and the martyrological Christian literature of the third and fourth centuries of the common era.

Such results provide insight into the proper setting and purpose of John's gospel. However, they also necessitate and suggest further research into questions raised by them:

1. If the farewell discourse does stand as the center of John's gospel, how are the initial twelve chapters to be interpreted in that light? Do they merely provide the biographical information about the one giving the farewell address to set forth his authority, which would, in turn, tie John's work even closer to the farewell discourse pattern? Such a conclusion would open up broader vistas as to the potentialities of expression in the literary form of gospel.

2. Further investigation is needed to consider the relationship of apocalyptic and the Gospel of John. If John does stand at a crossroads between the Jewish apocalyptic world view and that of the gnostics, such study would likely provide information for more adequately reconstructing the development of apocalyptic thinking and the transition to a more gnostic understanding. It would show, certainly, that apocalyptic and gnostic approaches are not black and white systems but belong to a much more complex thought world and, as terms, probably do not help clarify the pluralism of early Christian life.

3. John's gospel also appears to provide a vital link in the convergence of apocalyptic and martyrological literature, and the study of John with this convergence in view would help to clarify the development of early Christian literature in general. The study needs to be illumined further by a lengthier investigation of other canonical and

apostolic literature with the persecution theme in mind to see if the Christian movement, in accord with Ratschow's suggestion, was a movement from initial openness to the world toward one of self-preservation against the world. A cursory reading of Ignatius, for example, raises the question whether John's gospel was the example *par excellence* for the image of martyrdom in the church of the second century. A related question to this is the question of heresy: did the increasing concern over "false teachers" derive its impetus from persecution situations when the church sought to remain united against hostile powers? Other johannine literature, such as I John and the Apocalypse of John might provide clues which could answer to such a hypothesis.

4. This study has suggested the importance of the question of the absence of Jesus in John, which leads, in turn, to a question of theodicy: how does one speak of the justice of God when the savior has departed and the community is left to fend for itself in hostile territory? John answers this by turning the community back upon its own resources. The question of theodicy is answered by the very presence of the community in the world. The loss of Jesus is the positive key to the continuing justice of God and the vindication of his promises. The puzzle is how communities which were influenced by johannine thought solved the problem of authority. Assuming that John and not Paul was the most influential figure for the second century church (from

an historical perspective), what role did he play, if at all, in the development of an understanding of authority? Is the Paraclete the authoritative figure, or do the final chapters reaffirm apostolic authority? I John might be a clue that the Spirit was the original authority and the problem with false teachers finally demanded that apostolic teaching become normative to combat the "many spirits" rampant among the Christian communities.

5. A final point has to do with the hermeneutical question of the canon: in an age of secularization, when theological language is in rapid flux, does any significance remain in a biblical canon? Does such a collection have any contemporary significance at all? The methodological suppositions of this dissertation do provide a clue for its possible significance. They help to demonstrate that what is normative about the canon is not its theological or christological formulations, which vary considerably, but is its approaches and flexibility in facing the problems besetting the communities as they encountered the world. Thus, even though the theological formulations are inadequate for contemporary life, its pictures of the adaptability of the early communities might provide a normative guide for the Christian community today. Such a generalization focuses on the canon as occasional literature, works which emphasize not dogmatic exactitudes but changing theological understandings (within limits--and that is an issue to be grappled with as well) for

meeting specific situations.

These questions are raised by the analysis of the Fourth Gospel undertaken in this dissertation and they pose problems which, if solved, might aid in a renewed understanding of why the Christian community does, or should, survive in an age of secularization. This is a question of both socio-historical _and_ theological significance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Attwater, Donald, *Martyrs. From St. Stephen to John Tung*, London: Sheed and Ward, 1958.

Barrett, C. K., *The Gospel According to St. John*, London: S. P. C. K., 1958.

Bauer, Walter, *Das Johannesevangelium*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933.

Beare, F. W., *The First Epistle of Peter*, Oxford: Blackwell's, 1947.

Becker, Heinz, *Die Reden des Johannesevangeliums und der Stil der gnostischen Offenbarungsrede*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956.

Berger, Peter, *The Sacred Canopy. Elements in a Sociological Theory of Religion*, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1967.

Behler, G. M., *The Last Discourse of Jesus*, trans. by Robert T. Francoeur, Baltimore: Helicon, 1965.

Betz, Hans Dieter, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1967.

Betz, Otto, *Der Paraklet*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.

Böcher, Otto, *Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gehd Mohn, 1965.

Bousset, Wilhelm and Gressmann, H., *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, 3rd. ed., Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926.

Brown, Raymond E., *The Gospel According to John*, The Anchor Bible, Vol. 29, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1966.

Bultmann, Rudolf, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, Abt. II, 15th ed. (with *Ergänzungsheft*), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.

________, and Weiser, Artur, *Faith*. Bible Key Words from G. Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, trans. by Dorothea M. Barton, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1961.

________, *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 Vols., trans. by Kendrick Grobel, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

Campenhausen, H. von, *Die Idee des Martyriums in der alten Kirche*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964.

Charles, R. H., *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Vol. 2, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1915.

________, *The Book of Enoch*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1893.

Colwell, Ernest C. and Titus, Eric L., *The Gospel of the Spirit: A Study in the Fourth Gospel*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953.

Corell, A., *Consummatum Est. Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of St. John*, trans. by Order of the Holy Paraclete, Whitby, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

Cross, F. L., I Peter. *A Paschal Liturgy*, London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1954.

Cullmann, O., *Les sacraments dans l'Évangile johannique*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1951.

Davies, W. D., *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1964.

Dibelius, Martin, *Der Brief des Jakobus*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

Dillmann, August, *Das Buch Henoch*, Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1853.

Dodd, C. H., *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development*, London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd., 1936.

________, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1963.

________, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1953.

Dupont, Jacques, *Le discours de Milet. Testament pastoral de Saint Paul (Acts 20, 18-36)*, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1962.

Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 1, with English translation by Kirsopp Lake, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Farmer, William R., *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

Faulhaber, Doris, *Das Johannesevangelium und die Kirche*, Kassell: Johannes Stuada Verlag, 1938.

Frend, W. H. C., *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church*, Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967.

Furnish, Victor P., *Paul's Exhortations in the Context of His Letters and Thought*, Dissertation of Yale University, New Haven, 1960.

________, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.

Glasson, Thomas F., *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, Naperville, Ill.: Alec. R. Allenson, 1963.

Goppelt, Leonhard, *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert: Ein Aufriss der Urgeschichte der Kirche*, Gutersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1954.

Grill, Julius, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums, zweiter Teil*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1923.

Hare, Douglas R. A., *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1967.

Heise, Jürgen, *Bleiben. Meinein in den johanneischen Schriften*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1967.

Hirsch, Emanuel, *Studien zum vierten Evangelium*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936.

________, *Das vierte Evangelium*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1936.

Hoskyns, Edwin C., *The Fourth Gospel*, ed. by Davey, Francis Noel, London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1961.

Hughes, Henry M., *The Ethics of Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, London: R. Culley, 1908.

Juster, Jean, *Les Juifs dans l'émpire romain*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1914.

Käsemann, Ernst, *Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966.

Kamlah, Ehrhard, *Die Form der katalogischen Paranese im Neuen Testament*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964.

Lagrange, Marie Joseph, *Évangile selon Saint Jean*, Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1927.

Lazure, Noël, *Les valeurs morales de la théologie johannique*, Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1965.

Lightfoot, R. H., *St. John's Gospel*, ed. by C. F. Evans, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956.

Loisy, Alfred Firmin, *Le quatrième Évangile*, Paris: Alphonse Picard et File, 1903.

Martyn, J. Louis, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Meyer, Arnold, *Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes*, Giessen: Alfred Topelmann, 1930.

Moffatt, James, *Love in the New Testament*, New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930.

Mowinckel, Sigmund, *He That Cometh*, trans. by G. W. Anderson, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955.

Mussner, Franz, *The Historical Jesus in the Gospel of St. John*, trans. by W. J. O'Hara, New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.

________, *ZΩH. Die Anschauung vom "Leben" im vierten Evangelium*, München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1952.

Noack, Bent, *Zur johanneischen Tradition*, Kopenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1954.

Nygren, Anders, *Agape and Eros*, trans. by Philip S. Watson, London: S. P. C. K., 1953.

Oesterley, William O. E., *The Books of the Apocrypha*, New York: F. H. Revell Co., 1914.

Preiss, Theo, Life In Christ, Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1954.

Prunet, Olivier, La morale chrétienne d'apres les ecrits johanniques, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957.

Quasten, Johannes, Patrology, Vol. 1, Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press.

Rad, Gerhard von, Old Testament Theology, Vol. 2, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker, New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Riddle, Donald W., The Martyrs. A Study in Social Control, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931.

Rowley, H. H., The Relevance of Apocalyptic, London: Luttenworth Press, 1944.

Ruckstuhl, Eugen, Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums, Freiburg: Paulusverlag, 1951.

Russell, D. S., The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Schlatter, Adolf, Der Evangelist Johannes, Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1960.

________, Der Glaube im Neuen Testament, Stuttgart: Calver Verlag, 1927.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf, The Church in the New Testament, trans. by W. J. O'Hara, New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

________, The Moral Teaching of the New Testament, trans. by J. Holland-Smith and W. J. O'Hara, New York: Herder and Herder, 1965.

Schulz, Siegfried, Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1960.

Schweitzer, Albert, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. by William Montgomery, London: A. & C. Black, 1931.

Schweizer, Eduard, Ego Eimi, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965.

________, Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern, Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1955.

Scott, E. F., *The Fourth Gospel. Its Purpose and Theology*, 2nd ed., Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1930.

Selwyn, Edward G., *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, London: Macmillan and Co., 1952.

Spicq, Ceslaus, *Agape in the New Testament*, Vol. 3, trans. by Marie Aquinas McNamare and Mary Honoria Richter, St. Louis: B. Herder, 1966.

________, *Theologie morale du Nouveau Testament*, 2 Vols., Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1965.

Stauffer, Ethelbert, *New Testament Theology*, trans. by John Marsh, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1955.

Strachan, Robert H., *The Fourth Gospel. Its Significance and Environment*, London: S. C. M. Press, 1955.

Strack, Hermann, and Billerbeck, Paul, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 6 Volumes, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.

Strathmann, Hermann, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

Surkau, Hans-Werner, *Martyrien in jüdischer und frühchristlicher Zeit*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1938.

Titus, Eric L., *The Message of the Fourth Gospel*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957.

Torrey, C. C., *The Apocryphal Literature*, London: Oxford University Press, 1945.

Volz, Paul, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934.

Wachs, H. J., *Johanneische Ethik*, Dissertation at the University of Kiel, 1952.

Weiss, Bernhard, *Das Johannes-Evangelium. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1893.

Weiss, Johannes, *Earliest Christianity. A History of the Period A.D. 30-150*, Vol. 2, trans. by F. C. Grant, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Wellhausen, Julius, Das Evangelium Johannis, Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1908.

Westcott, B. F., The Gospel According to St. John, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1958.

Wilder, Amos, Eschatology and Ethics in the Teaching of Jesus, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

________, Kerygma, Eschatology, and Social Ethics, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

________, The Language of the Gospel; Early Christian Rhetoric, New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Workman, H. B., Persecution in the Early Church, London: The Epworth Press, 1906.

Wrede, Wilhelm, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963.

Windisch, Hans, Die katholischen Briefe, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1930.

ARTICLES

Allen, E. L., "The Jewish Christian Church in the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Biblical Literature 74 (1955), pp. 88-92.

Barrett, C. K., "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series 1 (1950) pp. 1-15.

Barrosse, T., "The Relationship of Love to Faith in St. John," Theological Studies 18 (1957), pp. 538-559.

Barth, C., "Disciples of the Servant," South East Asia Journal of Theology 6 (April, 1965), pp. 14-16.

Beer, G., "Das Buch Henoch," Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, Vol. 2, ed. by E. F. Kautzsch, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1900, pp. 217-310.

Betz, Hans Dieter, "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism," Journal for Theology and the Church 6 (1969), pp. 134-156.

Bornkamm, G., "Der Paraklet im Johannesevangelium," in *Festchrift für Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. by E. Wolf, *Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag*, 1949, pp. 12-35.

________, "Zur Interpretation des Johannes-evangeliums," *Evangelische Theologie* 28 (Januar, 1968), pp. 8-25.

Bowen, C. R., "Love in the Fourth Gospel," *Journal of Religion* 13 (1933), pp. 39-49.

Bowker, J. W., "The Orifin and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 11 (1964-65), pp. 398-408.

Brandt, W., "Wandel als Zeugnis nach dem I Pertrusbrief," *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum*, Festschrift für Otto *Schmitz*, ed. by Werner Foerster, Witten: Luther Verlag, 1953, pp. 10-25.

Brown, Raymond E., "The Kerygma of the Gospel According to John," *Interpretation* 21 (October, 1967), pp. 387-400.

________, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 13 (January, 1967), pp. 113-132.

Bultmann, Rudolf, "Die Beduetung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 24, 1925, pp. 100-146.

________, "   ," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel, Vol. 1, trans, by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Wm. Eerdmans, 1964, pp. 689-719.

________, "Die Eschatologie des Johannes-Evangeliums," *Glauben und Verstehen*, Vol. 1, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964, pp. 134-152.

________, "Man Between the Times According to the New Testament," *Existence and Faith*, trans. by Schubert M. Ogden, New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1960, pp. 248-266.

Buswell, J. O., Jr., "The Ethics of 'Believe' in the Fourth Gospel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 80 (1923), pp. 28-37.

Cadier, Jean, "The Unity of the Church. An Exposition of John 17," trans. by Colette Preiss, *Interpretation* 11 (1957), pp. 166-176.

Cadoux, C. F., "The Imperatival Use of ἵνα in the New Testament," *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1941), pp. 165-173.

Caird, G. B., "The Will of God in the Fourth Gospel," *Expository Times* 72 (1960-61), pp. 115-117.

Campenhausen, Hans von, "Zur Auslegung von Joh. 13.6-10," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 32 (1933), pp. 259-271.

Carroll, K. L., "The Fourth Gospel and the Exclusion of Christians from the Synagogues," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1957-58), pp. 19-32.

Cerfaux, L., "La charite fraternelle et le retour du Christ (Jo. 13:33-38)," *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 24 (1948), pp. 321-332.

Charlier, J. P., "L'éxégèse johannique d'un précepte légal," *Revue Biblique* 67 (1960), pp. 503-15.

Colwell, E. C., "The Fourth Gospel and the Struggle for Respectability," *Journal of Religion* 14 (1934), pp. 286-305.

Dahl, Nils A., "The Johannine Church and History," *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, ed. by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder, New York: Harper and Row, 1962, pp. 124-142.

Daube, David, "Participle and Imperative in I Peter," in E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1952, pp. 467-488.

Dibelius, M., "Joh. 15.13: Eine Studie zum Traditionalsproblem des Johannes-Evangeliums," *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927, pp. 168-186.

Dobschütz, von, "Zum Charakter des 4. Evangeliums," *Zeitschrift des Neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft* 28 (1929), pp. 161-177.

Dodd, C. H., "The First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 21 (1937), pp. 129-156.

________, "The Portrait of Jesus in John and in the Synoptics," *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, ed. by W. R. Farmer, C. F. C. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr, Cambridge: The University Press, 1967, pp. 183-198.

Ebeling, Gerhard, "The Ground of Christian Theology," *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969), pp. 47-68.

________, "Jesus and Faith," *Word and Faith*, trans. by James W. Leitch, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963, pp. 201-246.

Evans, E., "The Verb 'ΑΓΑΠΑΝ ' in the Fourth Gospel," *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. by F. L. Cross, London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1967, pp. 64-71.

Faure, Alexander, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese, *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 21 (1922), pp. 99-121.

Fridricksen, A., "Bemerkungen zur Fusswaschung. Joh. 13," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 38 (1939), pp. 94-96.

Gaugler, Ernst, "Die Bedeutung der Kirche in den johanneischen Schriften," *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 14 (1924), pp. 97-117; 181-219; and 15 (1925), pp. 27-42.

Grundmann, W., "Das Wort von Jesu Freunden (Joh. 15.13-16) und das Herrenmahl," *Novum Testamentum* 3 (1959), pp. 62-69.

Gutbrod, W., "νόμος ," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. 4, ed. by G. Kittel, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942, pp. 1016-1084.

Harrelson, W., "The Idea of Agape in the New Testament," *Journal of Religion* 31 (1951), pp. 169-182.

Hatch, W. H. P., "The Meaning of John 16:8-11," *Harvard Theological Review* 14 (1921), pp. 103-105.

Hauck, F., "καρπός ," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. 3, ed. by G. Kittel, trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Wm. Eerdmans, 1965, pp. 614-616.

________, " μένω ," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. 4, ed. by G. Kittel, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1942, pp. 578-593.

Hogg, C. F., "Note on ἀγαπάω and φιλέω ," *Expository Times* 38 (1927), pp. 379-380.

Holl, Karl, "Die schriftstellerische Form des griechischen Heiligenlebens," *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. 2, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1928, pp. 249-269.

Hunzinger, Cl. H., "Die jüdische Bannpraxis im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 80 (1955), cols. 114-115.

Johnson, Sherman E., "Early Christianity in Asia Minor," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77 (1958), pp. 1-17.

Käsemann, Ernst, "The Beginnings of Christian Theology," *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969), pp. 17-46.

________, "Ketzer und Zeuge," *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*, Vol. 1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964, pp. 168-187.

Kallas, James, "The Apocalypse--An Apocalyptic Book?," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86 (March, 1967), pp. 69-80.

Kaplan, C., "The Pharisaic Character and the Date of the Book of Enoch," *Anglican Theological Review* 12 (1929-30), pp. 531-537.

Keck, Leander E., "Apocalyptic and the New Testament," unpublished paper delivered to the Association of Disciples for Theological Discussion, November, 1968.

Knox, J., "Pliny and I Peter: A Note on I Peter 4:14-16 and 3:15," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953), pp. 187-189.

Kundsin, Karl, "Die Wiederkunft Jesu in den Abschiedsreden des Johannesevangeliums," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 33 (1934), pp. 210-215.

Lohmeyer, E., "Die Fusswaschung," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 38 (1939), pp. 74-94.

Lohse, E., "Paränese und Kerygma im I Pet.," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 45 (1954), pp. 68-89.

Michel, O., "Das Gebet des scheidenden Erlösers, *Zeitschrift der Systematischen Theologie* 18 (1941), pp. 521-534.

Montefiore, H., "Thou Shalt Love the Neighbour As Thyself," *Novum Testamentum* 5 (1962), pp. 157-170.

Moran, W. L., "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 25 (1963), pp. 77-87.

Morrison, C. D., "Mission and Ethic; an Interpretation of John 17," *Interpretation* 19 (1965), pp. 259-273.

Moule, C. F. D., "The Nature and Purpose of I Peter," *New Testament Studies* 3 (1956-57), pp. 1-11.

Munck, Johannes, "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la littérature biblique," *Au sources de la tradition chrétiènne*, ed. by M. Goguel, Neuchatel-Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1950, pp. 155-170.

Mussner, F., "Die Fusswashung (Jn. 13.1-17)," *Geist und Leben* 31 (1958), pp. 25-30.

Nauck, W., "Freude im Leiden," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46 (1955), pp. 68-80.

Nikolainen, A. T., "Der Kirchenbegriff in der Offenbarung des Johannes, *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962-63), pp. 351-361.

O'Connell, M. J., "The Concept of Commandment in the Old Testament," *Theological Studies* 21 (1960), pp. 351-403.

Phillips, G. L., "Faith and Vision in the Fourth Gospel," *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. by F. L. Cross, London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., 1957, pp. 83-96.

Ratschow, C. H., "Agape. Nächstenliebe und Bruderliebe," *Zeitschrift der Systematischen Theologie* 21 (1950), pp. 160-182.

Robinson, John A. T., "The Destination and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 6 (1959-60), pp. 117-131.

Sanders, J. N., "Those Whom Jesus Loved (Jn. 11.5)," *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954-55), pp. 29-41.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf, "Das Johannesevangelium als Hermeneutische Frage," *New Testament Studies* 13 (1967), pp. 197-210.

Schneider, J., "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Komposition von Joh. 13.31-17.26," in *Gott und die Götter, Festgabe für E. Fascher*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958, pp. 103-112.

Schrenk, G., "ἐντέλλομαι , ἐντολή ," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. 2, ed. by G. Kittel, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1935, pp. 541-553.

Schweizer, E., "Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church," *New Testament Studies* 2 (1955-56), pp. 87-99.

________, "Geist und Gemeinde im Neuen Testament und heute," *Theologische Existenz heute* N.S. 32 (1952), pp. 27-33.

________, "Der Kirchenbegriff im Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes," *Neotestamentica*, Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963, pp. 254-271.

Selwyn, E. G., "Eschatology in I Peter," *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed., by W. D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge: The University Press, 1956, pp. 394-401.

________, "The Persecutions in I Peter," *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Bulletin* 1 (1950), pp. 39-50.

Simpson, Ian G., "The Holy Spirit in the Fourth Gospel, *The Expositor* 9th Series 4 (1925), pp. 292-299.

Snape, H. C., "The Fourth Gospel, Ephesus and Alexandria," *Harvard Theological Review* 47 (1954), pp. 1-14.

Spicq, C., "Notes d'exégèse johannique. La charité est amour manifeste," *Revue Biblique* 65 (1958), pp. 358-370.

Stählin, Gustav, "Zum Problem der johanneischen Eschatologie," *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 33 (1934), pp. 225-259.

Stagg, F., "Farewell Discourses (Jn. 13-17)," *Review and Expositor* 62 (1965), pp. 459-472.

Stauffer, E., "Abschiedsreden," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, Vol. 1, ed. by Theodor Klauser, Stuttgart: Hiersemann Verlag-G.M.B.H., 1950, Cols. 29-35.

________, " ἀγαπάω ," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Vol. 1, ed. by G. Kittel, trans. by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Grand Rapids: Wm. Eerdmans, 1964, pp. 21-55.

Suiss, Theobald, "Nachfolge Jesu," *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 78 (1953), cols. 129-140.

Torrey, C. C., "Alexander Janaeus and the Archangel Michael," Vetus Testamentum 4 (1954), pp. 208-211.

van Unnik, W. C., "Christianity According to I Peter," Expository Times 68 (1956-57), pp. 79-83.

________, "The Purpose of St. John's Gospel," Studia Evangelica. International Congress on the "Four Gospels in 1957," Oxford: Blackwell's, 1960, pp. 167-196.

________, "The Teaching of Good Works in I Peter," New Testament Studies 1 (1954), pp. 92-110.

Via, D. O., Jr., "Darkness, Christ, and the Church in the Fourth Gospel," Scottish Journal of Theology 14 (1961), pp. 172-193.

Welch, Adam C., "A Zealot Pamphlet," Expositor 25 (1923), pp. 273-287.

Wenz, H., "Sehen und Glauben bei Johannes," Theologische Zeitschrift 17 (1961), pp. 17-25.

Wilder, Amos, "Eschatological Imagry and Earthly Circumstance," New Testament Studies 5 (1959), pp. 229-245.